THEOLOGY

VOL. LI JULY, 1948 No. 337

What is Anglicanism?—II

THE question is whether a church, I should say the Church, can be, and if so ought to be, both Catholic and Protestant. In the remainder of this paper I want to go some way towards showing what this question means. For obviously, thus stated, it begs many questions. Not least: What is meant by the words "Catholic" and "Protestant" in this context? The word "Catholic" is not used here in its primary and fundamental sense, which is that of the creed, but as pointing to one of two recognizably different types of Christian tradition and institution which have been familiar in the West since the Reformation. An ecclesiastically unsophisticated visitor from the European Continent, upon making his first acquaintance with the Church of England, will be puzzled to know to which type it belongs, and as his acquaintance becomes closer and deeper his perplexity may increase.

For on the one hand he will discover that the present-day Church of England not only claims, but displays many ostensible signs to support its claim, to be continuous with the pre-Reformation *Ecclesia Anglicana*, and in fact to be the same *Ecclesia Anglicana*, purged of medieval corruptions, and brought into line with scriptural and primitive standards. The least significant of these signs is the Church's tenure of the ancient cathedrals and parish churches. It is more significant that the cathedrals and parish churches are used for the same purposes as they ever were. Bishops are still enthroned in the cathedrals, and parish ministers are called priests and exercise priestly functions. As regards that, let me cite once more the disinterested witness of James Martineau:

> The sacerdotalism of the English Church (he said) is as absolute as that of the Roman. It matters little whether the sacraments be more or fewer; whether their *modus operandi* be a little more subjective or a little more objective; whether the right to absolve be used with the healthy or only with the sick—so long as a ritual purification of human nature is pronounced indispensable, and the patent-right to effect it is conceded by a *jus divinum* to a certain body of men, the whole mischief of the Papal scheme remains.[1]

It is true that our cathedrals and parish churches are commonly furnished in a less ornate and colourful manner than they were in the Middle Ages or are on the European Continent today, though they are kept in a much tidier and cleaner condition. Anyhow, the point is that from the baptism of infants to the obsequies of the departed they are used for the purposes for which they were built.

The Church of England has a liturgy, a "Book of Common Prayer."

[1] *Miscellanies*, p. 408.

Its liturgy is a simplified and amended form of what was traditional in Western Christendom, the amendments having been designed to bring it into accord with the canons of the ancient fathers. Again, the traditional Christian year—the calendar of feasts and fasts, of saints' days and holy days—continues to be observed, though also in a simplified form. The same creeds are recited, the same sacraments are administered, the same orders of the ministry are perpetuated, and great importance seems to be attached both in the Church's ordinal and in its practice to the maintenance of episcopal ordination, although the Church's divines hold various opinions about why this should be so. The hierarchical and synodical structure of the Church is in principle the same as it ever was (still all too feudal, some of us would say), though it has been expanded and reshaped to meet new needs. From these and other appearances our Continental visitor would infer that the Church of England is "Catholic."

On the other hand, he would find also plenty of no less unmistakable signs that it is "Protestant." Whatever a section of its members may have said during the last hundred years, the Church of England implicitly glories in the Reformation. Like other Reformed Churches, it rejects unequivocally the papal claims as they were asserted at the time of the Reformation, and still more as they have been developed since. It does not claim infallibility. ("Two things," said Hooker, "there are which greatly trouble these later times: one that the Church of Rome cannot, another that Geneva will not, err.") The Church of England's formularies and traditional divinity bear unambiguous testimony to the cardinal Reformation principle of justification by faith. Though it values tradition more than other Reformed Churches and explicitly appeals to the authority of "the catholic fathers and ancient bishops," it has ever stood for the open Bible, for "the sufficiency of the holy Scriptures for salvation," and in its public worship, while it provides for more preaching than any other "Catholic" Church, it reads more of the Bible each year than any other "Protestant" Church. "We use the Bible itself more frequently in our service than all the Protestant sects and all the Reformed churches together," said F. D. Maurice.[1]

That will suffice to indicate the Catholic and Protestant signs that the Church of England bears upon its face. And the question is: Are these the signs of a true Church, or the results of an indefensible compromise? The question is whether a true church ought to bear witness in its doctrine, its ordinances, its structure and its discipline to both Catholic and Protestant principles—whether at the time of the Reformation the truth lay neither with Rome nor with Geneva, but somewhere between or apart from them, and *mutatis mutandis* does so still? Or would an honest and intelligent Anglican perceive that he was faced by the predicament which was thus described by James Bryce in a letter that he wrote to a friend in 1864:

> No man can logically be an Anglican at all, but must either trust himself far more boldly to the conclusions of human reason, as Protestantism in its

[1] *The Kingdom of Christ* (1838), ii, 239.

genuine forms does, or else fling himself with eyes tight shut into the bosom of an infallible church.[1]

Is that the ineluctable dilemma which the Church of England is trying to evade?

Observe that the question is not whether a true church can or may contain some members who are or profess to be "Catholics" and others who are or profess to be "Protestants," and who for some reason or other agree to live in the same house without really cohabiting. That would be only a parody of a church. In these latter days the conception of Anglican comprehensiveness has been taken to mean that it is the glory of the Church of England to hold together in juxtaposition as many varieties of Christian faith and practice as are willing to agree to differ, so that the Church is regarded as a sort of league of religions. I have nothing to say for such an unprincipled syncretism. This debased conception of comprehensiveness has no sanction in our traditional standards, in our classical divines, or in the official witness of the Church today.

Samuel Wilberforce was on the Anglican spot when he wrote in his journal: "*Quaere*, have I hardness enough not to be ground to powder between the Evangelical and Newman mills?"[2] The principle of comprehension is that a Church ought to hold the fundamentals of the Faith and at the same time allow for differences of opinion and of interpretation in secondary matters, especially rites and ceremonies. It is this principle that excluded, if I may put it so, those who believed too little, for instance any who did not accept the creeds, as well as those who believed too much, for instance those who held that submission to the Bishop of Rome is necessary to salvation, or that Holy Scripture requires the presbyterian form of church government and permits no other. Within those limits, which were secured by a uniform liturgy and by Articles of Religion which purported to be positive where Scripture was positive and reticent where it was not, it allowed for the maximum of flexibility and variety.

It would seem, then, that the proper and distinctive task of Anglican theologians is to show, if it can be shown, that this principle is of permanent validity, though of changing application, and that it is upon this principle that the whole Church ought again to be brought into visible unity. But it is a task from which our modern divines have let themselves be a good deal distracted—excusably so, perhaps, in view of the number of fronts on which a modern divine is expected to fight, or at least to dawdle. What is distinctive of the Church of England is not a theological system, not an 'ism nor a collection of 'isms, but a theological method or direction. We ought not to try to reproduce or treat as permanently binding the teaching of our sixteenth- or seventeenth-century divines, but to study the method—their appeal to and use of Scripture, tradition and reason—by which they rejected Tridentine Catholicism and pure Calvinism, and to use that method today in examining and assessing Ultramontanism, neo-

[1] See H. A. L. Fisher, *James Bryce* (1927), i, 76.
[2] See A. R. Ashwell, *Life of Samuel Wilberforce* (1880), i, 136.

Calvinism and other contemporary systems. Our theology is true to its genius when it is seeking to reconcile opposed systems, rejecting them as exclusive systems, but showing that the principle for which each stands has its place within the total orbit of Christian truth, and in the long run is secure only within that orbit or (in the idiom of today) when it is held in tension with other apparently opposed, but really complementary, principles.

For example, the principle of justification by faith is fundamental, and we find it acknowledged by St Thomas Aquinas as well as by all the Reformers. But when, as in Lutheranism, it is made the basis of an exclusive system and everything seems to be built upon it alone, and the salvation promised to men here and now is apparently made to consist solely in the forgiveness of sin, then we must insist that sanctification is also a fundamental principle equally rooted in the biblical testimony, and that salvation means present incorporation into the mystical body of Christ and growth in holiness. Post-Tridentine Catholicism, while it has affirmed this latter principle, as Lutheranism has not, and has much to teach us about it, yet has also greatly erred by turning it into an elaborate system in which justification by faith is soft-pedalled and in effect denied by legalizing the Christian life and by separating moral from ascetic theology. We must, of course, admit that the Church of England has failed to bear adequate witness in practice to both the principles which it professes and to the reconciliation of which it is committed. Nevertheless, we shall not redress our failure by embracing either the Lutheran or the Ultramontane system, but by holding together the principles for which in this connexion each stands, and which, as developed into separate systems, distort the balance of the Faith.

This was the method both of our Thirty-nine Articles and of our standard divines, pursued in relation to the controversies of the period, and it is not difficult to see that the same method has been, and may again be, fruitfully applied to other perennial antitheses—for instance, those between creation and redemption, between revelation and reason, between the Bible and the Church, between the ministry of the word and of the sacraments, between world-affirmation and world-denial, between authority and freedom, and so forth. I am very far from saying that the method of reconciling apparent opposites can be or has been followed only by Anglican divines. Quite the contrary: it is a method that can be followed by divines anywhere in the universal Church, and in every church there have been divines who have followed it. Thus it is quite possible that a non-Anglican divine did represent the Anglican position at Bishopthorpe better than any of the Anglicans who were present. Perhaps the greatest theologians have all aimed at the reconciliation of contraries, and it is the camp followers who turn a many-sided into a one-sided divinity. As John Stuart Mill said, "In the human mind, one-sidedness has always been the rule, and many-sidedness the exception."[1]

If this be so, the most hopeful feature of the present theological

[1] *On Liberty*[3] (1864), p. 83.

landscape is the coming together of theologians who have been nurtured in different traditions and in different systems, and their edifying preference for listening to and learning from one another to refuting one another. It would be ridiculous for Anglicans to claim any monopoly of this admirable disposition. Rather, we should be thankful that, while we have nothing so impressive to point to as the great systems in which other traditions have originated or culminated, providence has assigned to us the modest role through these last centuries of witnessing, often no more than mutely, that the proponents of these systems are brethren in Christ, and that their principles, despite their rival systems, are reconciled in what F. D. Maurice called the constitution of the kingdom of Christ.

It is necessary to add that a theology of reconciliation or of comprehension does not mean a theology of moderation, of the *juste milieu*, of sitting on the fence, of nerveless indecision. That is what it may rot away into. But, rightly understood and in its genuine representatives, it is a theology, not of fog or haze, but of thunder and lightning; a theology which comes down off the fence, but not always on the same side, and which certainly does not fall into a copy-book place on a party line. It is a theology, of which you can never feel that you know just what it is going to do or say next—which is what I always do feel both about the theologies of a party and about the theology of moderation.

If it be granted, then, that we ought to pursue a theology of reconciliation, we shall need always to be on our guard against its characteristic corruptions. A theology of reconciliation is very easily degraded. It lends itself to the natural ambitions of a vicar of Bray and is liable to be exploited by more august time-servers. Sentimentalists and opportunists can use its language. A saying like "life is greater than logic" can be used as a pretext for shoddy thinking, the evasion of difficulties, and all kinds of superficiality. Even its best and sincerest adherents may acquire demoralizing habits and pursue unprincipled tactics, preferring peace before truth and putting safety first. Bishop Hensley Henson wrote of Archbishop Randall Davidson: "The life-long habit of 'getting round' difficulties, instead of facing them, hardly prepares a man for the handling of a crisis."[1] And again: "Unfortunately, his Grace has an inveterate habit of adding qualifications to every apparently clear declaration, until the final impression left is entirely different from that originally made."[2] In short, ecclesiastical statesmen, whose aim is to maintain an equilibrium, are inclined to cloak their designs in a theology of reconciliation, and so to discredit it.

The leaders of the Church of England are probably not as much aware as they need to be of this their peculiar peril. Still, it looks now as though crises of one kind or another—and the presence in our Church of theological fanatics of one kind or another—will put a stop to the most ingeniously contrived and persistently maintained equilibrium. It looks as though we are coming to a point where we

[1] Henson, *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life* (1943), ii, 183.
[2] *Ibid.*, ii, 203.

must either reconcile or perish, and where we must either show that the principle of comprehension is true and not merely Anglo-Saxon, or be driven from it.

Bishop Whipple of Minnesota, preaching before the Lambeth Conference of 1888,[1] coined the phrase "the Church of the Reconciliation" to describe the united Church to which he looked forward. Perhaps it is a title that indicates better than any other what is the Anglican position, and I would add that we should feel committed not only to the reconciliation of the Catholic and Protestant traditions in the West, but also of the Eastern and Western traditions[2] and to the reconciliation of the age-long faith with new discoveries and modes of thought. But only if we are continually being reconciled among ourselves can we hope to perform what seems to be the distinctive mission of the Anglican Communion, namely to call all Christians into unity upon the principle of comprehension.

A. R. Vidler.

(Concluded)

Christians and Jews

One of the latest contributions to the vexed questions of the relations between Christians and Jews comes from America. The Rev. A. Roy Eckardt, Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Laurence College, has brought an immense amount of industry and zeal to his task of trying to discover "a tenable theological basis for a Christian approach to the Jewish question." The most valuable feature of the book[3] is his examination of the causes of anti-semitism, and his insistence that it cannot be understood apart from human depravity and original sin. Many people are incapable of normal emotional reactions to the Jews. Jewish misdeeds of whatever kind evoke a hatred such as is not felt even for the Nuremberg criminals or the Japanese war lords, and Jewish suffering is lightly dismissed. In the words of the Catholic writer François Mauriac, "The strange thing is this, the massacred millions of Jews and tortured Jewish children have made no difference in men's feelings towards them. . . . The Jewish people is coming up from the depth of its fearful martyrdom into a world which has not laid down arms against it. But where its former protectors seem bent on shutting in its face the gates of the promised Land." Mr Eckardt goes in great detail into the reasons for this almost universal attitude to the Jews, and discusses the various alleged causes of anti-semitism, religious, psychological and economic, only to reach the conclusion that, "although much scholarship has been put into the investigation of anti-semitism, its nature has by no means been divulged."

He goes on to discuss some solutions and their limitations: education,

[1] See R. T. Davidson, *The Lambeth Conferences of* 1867, 1878 *and* 1888 (1889), p. 246.

[2] Cp. *Catholicity: a Study in the Conflict of Christian Traditions in the West.* This Report, which is a notable example of what I mean by the method of reconciliation, was published only after I had prepared the present paper; otherwise I should often have had occasion to refer to it. I am glad to hear from Mr Rupp that other Reports are being prepared on similar lines. For a different method of seeking to determine the Anglican position, see L. A. Haselmayer, *Lambeth and Unity* (Dacre Press, 15s.).

[3] *Christianity and the Children of Israel,* King's Crown Press, New York.

assimilation, Zionism, the ending of economic frustrations (he does not say how this is to be achieved), ridicule (the lampooning of anti-semites), integrationism (save the mark!), conversion, and the combating of the notion that Christianity is better than Judaism. Mr Eckardt is most reliable in his setting out of the inadequacies of all solutions which seek to deal with the problem on a purely rational level. He rightly insists that all aspects of life are affected by sin, and that anti-semitism is a particularly devilish illustration of original sin. It is in his last two "solutions" that he is least satisfactory. He agrees that the superiority or otherwise of Christianity to Judaism is a question not of ethics but of revelation. Few would deny that conversion cannot be a solution to anti-semitism, if for no other reason than that so to regard it would debase the purpose of baptism. But, whatever one may think of Christian missions to Jews, it is incredible that a believer in the Incarnation should describe missionary activity as "polytheism" and "idolatry."

The book has another fault: that is the extremely irritating style, which is due to the fact that it consists almost entirely of quotations. The author is trying to assess the attitude of Roman Catholicism, fundamentalist Protestantism, liberal Protestantism and "neo-Reformation thought" represented *inter alia* by the Dutch Church, Karl Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr. His sympathies are with the last-named school, but at times his striving for objectivity makes it difficult to know whether he supports or condemns a point of view. This makes the book tedious to read.

In spite of these defects of content and style, there is much in the book that is valuable. The ruthless exposure of the part played by Christianity in fostering anti-semitism calls for tears of shame that are too often absent. The attitude of the Roman Church in particular is shown to be open to serious criticism. On several occasions in recent years the Pope has condemned anti-semitism, but the *Osservatore Romano* and the Jesuit paper *Civilta Cattolica* have published statements containing the crudest anti-semitism. Protestantism is also guilty. "The lack of political ethics of Lutheranism made it a reactionary force which encouraged the power of the state and reinforced nationalism; it was therefore a contributory force to the development of the . . . nazi state."

The fact is that the Church has made it impossible for successive generations of Jews to accept Christ. We have presented Him to them as a God of violence and hatred. A Jew from Eastern Europe said to me, "The cross means to me the murder of my relations." For centuries Christians have taught Jews to expect murder and rapine as the fruits of our religion. St Ambrose approved of the burning of synagogues; St Louis said, "The only argument a Jew understands is a knife." The Spanish Inquisitor boasted: "Show me a Jew, and I will show you a burnt Jew." In Czarist Russia it was at the great Christian festivals that the worst pogroms took place. Archbishop Hlond of Poland in 1936 called for a boycott of Jewish firms, and ten years later refused to condemn the murder of forty-one Jews at Keilce or to contradict the ritual murder lie that was its cause. We in England

cannot claim to be members of the Catholic Church and disclaim all responsibility. In 1938 a churchwarden in East London said to me that he would rather Jewish children were tortured to death in concentration camps than be permitted to enter this country. In 1948 an Anglican bishop, also in my hearing, after condemning anti-semitism as unchristian, went on to reiterate that the Jews had behaved "worse than any people in Europe"; worse, that is, than the Nazis, the Spanish and Italian fascists, and the Russian Communists. These are not isolated examples of emotional "blind spots." They are constantly met.

In Jewish eyes there is a close connexion between Continental anti-semitism and the utterances of Anglican ecclesiastics who show complete lack of comprehension of the scope of the Jewish tragedy and condemn the deeds of people maddened by despair, without condemning the policy that has driven them mad. Christians, in fact, commit the deadly sin of disfiguring the face of Christ. The travesty of Him that our actions and attitudes present to the Jews makes a mockery in their eyes of the claim that He is God of Love. There is dreadful truth in Mr Eckardt's statement: "The symbol 'Christ' has been so corrupted through sins committed by the Church in Christ's Name that, while it may be impossible to employ another symbol (*sic*) to stand for the event of divine-human reconciliation, the Church must remember that when Christ is preached to the Jews, the latter may be prompted to think immediately of the terrible evils they have suffered at the hand of those who bear the name of Christ."

For our sins we must make reparation in so far as in us lies. Penitence should replace the soul-destroying complacency and smugness which is everywhere so prevalent. Not being without sin, we have throughout the ages stoned the Jews. "Judge not that ye be not judged." The Jews are under judgment, but, as Père Leroux des Pères de Sion[1] pointed out, "It is not for Christians to decide in what measure and to what extent the account must be settled. Still less is it for them to constitute themselves the instrument of the judgment."[2] If the Jews are under judgment for rejecting Christ, so are we. Almost the whole "Christian" world is apostate. Léon Bloy observed that the veil which covers the eyes of Israel is now passing from Jews to Christians. Having known Him we have turned away. Our guilt is the greater.

Surely the most effective way of showing penitence and of making reparation is to strive to end the conditions which make Jewish persecution endemic, namely Jewish homelessness. Goodwill and tolerance are not enough. Mr Eckardt, referring to the distinction between "moral men and immoral society," observes: "In the wider areas of alleviating the Jewish plight it would appear that the use of power may have to supplement the practice of tolerance." In this connexion reference may be made to an interesting pamphlet, *Is this the way?*, which has recently appeared.[3] The author, Dr Zander,

[1] Hillel, Paris.

[2] *Cf.* a statement by the Dutch Church: "The fact that God has a judgment to bring on the Jews does not mean that we and others who are pagans by nature are also authorized to judge them."

[3] Gollancz, 1s.

writing as a Jew, is rightly sensitive about the moral principles which have always been the foundation of Zionism, however much individuals may have deviated from them. He takes his people severely to task for their dealings with the Arabs and the British during the past and for the insistence of Jewish leaders on the necessity of a Jewish state. There is admittedly much to criticize in the conduct of these leaders, but one cannot escape the feeling that Dr Zander is being over-optimistic about the results of a more conciliatory attitude on their part. He writes: "The spirit of responsibility must express itself first and foremost in our relations to the Arab population in the Jewish State." That is certainly true; but if the policy advocated by Dr Zander had been adopted the whole of Palestine would by now be an Arab state, containing a ghetto, and the purpose of the National Home, *i.e.* the restoration of the human dignity of the Jews, would have been destroyed. Dr Zander, like the liberal Protestants, fails to take sufficiently into account the evil in human beings and society, which is one of the main justifications for the existence of the State as the instrument of the community. How insecure would be our position in these islands if we depended on the toleration of the others. Yet that at best has been the condition under which Jews have lived for centuries, and seldom has that best prevailed. Generations of Jews have been conditioned to realize that the world is hostile to them. If they have tended to become clannish and aggressive (or loyal and enterprising), much of the responsibility lies with the Gentiles. The human dignity of the Jews has been continuously injured by their statelessness, and it is a Christian duty to help them to achieve that amount of political security which statehood confers, and which we take for granted for ourselves.

To quote Père Leroux once more: "If the Jewish state is really the sole means of giving the Jews those rights which belong to all men, not only do I see nothing in the Christian religion which obliges Christians to oppose it, but justice and charity make it a Christian duty to support their aims and efforts. Would it be not very distressing if one day Christians were reproached with having neglected a serious duty of justice and charity towards the Jewish people in what is perhaps the most sorrowful hour of its history?"

In the eyes of many Jews, Christian sincerity will be judged by our attitude to their sufferings which are caused by homelessness. In the eyes of God, how can we escape condemnation if we take upon ourselves to pass judgment on their sins, and do nothing at all to relieve their sufferings?

HELENA CHARLES.

The Christian Shaliach and the Jewish Apostle—A Reply

IT is gratifying to know that Dr Hunkin has been reading *The Apostolic Ministry* with such care, even though he seems to have made rather heavy weather of some of it. Clearly, he is not convinced by what I have said there about the Jewish *shaliach*. I am aware that my

essay could be improved a good deal, but not, I think, along the lines indicated by his criticisms. At first I wondered whether his difficulties were not chiefly verbal; he seems so disturbed because I have called an "institution" what he calls a "custom," and a "plenipotentiary" what he calls an "agent" or "representative." But in ordinary English usage a recognized "custom" is called an "institution," and a "plenipotentiary" is by definition a "representative" of another fully authorized to conclude for his principal. Dr Hunkin may be presumed to know this; and it was obvious in what senses I—following other and much greater scholars—used those particular words of the *shaliach*. He himself seems to think that his difficulties lie chiefly in the field of historical evidence, though there are indications that they really arise a good deal deeper, in the region of theological conviction; but it is difficult to judge fairly of that while his interpretation of the evidence has only been vaguely and negatively sketched, in the process of rejecting mine. Yet it may help to clear the ground to run through the particular points he raises about the historical evidence before dealing broadly with the main question.

(1) Dr Hunkin dislikes my terming the word ἀπόστολος "the mere translation" of *shaliach*. (What I said was "the equivalent or rather the mere translation.") I called it so because in the LXX the word ἀπόστολος is used to translate the word *shaliach* in the Hebrew text.

(2) Dr Hunkin says that our Lord "is never reported as addressing the Twelve as Apostles," though Luke "often" refers to them as such. I had put the same point rather more accurately (*Ap. M.*, pp. 229 *seq.*) thus: the "Apostles" are never so called in Matthew or Mark, except in connexion with a mission *away from* our Lord. Luke does three times allude to them as "Apostles" in His presence. "The reason is, of course, that in the presence of his principal the *shaliach* has no function and virtually no existence as such, in the Jewish idea" (*Ap. M.*, p. 230).

(3) Dr Hunkin remarks: "It was strongly argued by Dr Kirsopp Lake that it was the Greek-speaking Church of Antioch 'which hit on the idea of using the rare but natural word *apostolos*,' "[1] and complains that I make no reference to Lake's "important" note. Since the whole width of a radical divergence about Christian origins really lies between us here, I will be more detailed.

Lake did not "argue strongly," or indeed "argue" at all. He rejected in one condescending sentence the whole thesis of Harnack "in his *Mission und Ausbreitung* that the word (ἀπόστολος) was first adopted by Jews . . ." (Lake, *not. cit.*, p. 46). Then, after two pages of incomplete statement of the evidence, he asserted in another sentence that "more probably it was the Greek-speaking Church of Antioch which hit on the idea of using the rare but natural word ἀπόστολος." I ignored Lake's note, because it had not entered my head that anyone now alive could take its thesis seriously. Even now I am not persuaded that the discussion has been advanced by the reproduction of a confused version of some parts of it in the May Theology. But since Dr Hunkin has associated himself with Lake's

[1] Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity* (1933), vol. v, p. 50.

thesis, and since his own view of the N.T. Apostolate is largely bound up with it, he is entitled to an answer.

Except in Herodotus (i, 21; v, 38) *ἀπόστολος* in classical Greek never means a "messenger," but always a "naval expedition" or "fleet." Hesychius says it can also mean an "admiral," but this sense is not found in the extant literature. In the papyri it has the sense of a commercial document, usually an "invoice" or ship's "bill of lading"; once, apparently, of some sort of "passport." I submit to Dr Hunkin that in a busy commercial port like Antioch it was not likely to be a very "rare" word, but also that it was not a very "natural" word for first-century Greeks to adopt for a religious leader.

On the other hand, the verb *shalach* appears in the Hebrew O.T. (on a rough computation) about 700 times. In the LXX it is represented about thirty times by *πέμπειν*, rather more often by *ἐξαποστέλλειν*, and some 600 odd times by *ἀποστέλλειν*. Its pual participle *shaliach* is rare (seven times) and found only once substantivally (1 Kgs. xiv, 6), where LXX translates by *ἀπόστολος*. Ahijah the Prophet says to the wife of Jeroboam *ἔγω εἰμι ἀπόστολος πρός σε σκληρός*, a direct rendering of the Hebrew "I am a *shaliach* unto thee harsh." *Shaliach* here hardly means "messenger." The Queen has come to the Prophet, not the Prophet to the Queen. He delivers the self-fulfilling "Word of the Lord" upon her, and there can be no appeal beyond. He acts as (what I mean by) the "plenipotentiary" of God, fulfilling his mandate.

Further, Josephus knows the word *ἀπόστολος* in the sense of the act of "commissioning" (*Ant.* xvii, xi, 1),[1] which is unexampled in Greek usage. Dr Hunkin agrees that in the third and fourth centuries A.D. the *shelihim* of the Jewish patriarchs were styled *ἀπόστολοι*. As Harnack argued, it is very unlikely that the Jews would have created an official class of "Apostles"—they are styled by Lake "legates from the Patriarchs with important powers" (*not. cit.*, p. 49)—*after* the appearance of the Christian "Apostles." The term in Judaism must therefore antedate *c.* A.D. 40-50.

I submit to Dr Hunkin that Harnack's thesis that the word *ἀπόστολος* was first adopted by Jews as the current translation of *shaliach* has all the evidence behind it, and that Lake's counter-thesis has none at all and some against it. If Dr Hunkin likes to say that, after all, it was perhaps first taken into *Christian* use by Greek-speaking Christian Jews at Antioch, he is, of course, entitled to his guess. But were there no Greek-speaking Christian Jews in earlier days at Jerusalem who might have felt a need for the word? How did the grumbling "Hellenistic" widows formulate their complaints against the neglectful *Shelihim*?

None of these facts is very recondite. Some of them are mentioned, correctly or incorrectly, in Lake's note which I am accused of neglecting. I am bound to assume that Dr Hunkin refreshed his

[1] Lake (*not. cit.*, p. 46) introduces a gratuitous perplexity by saying that "Josephus speaks of Varus, the head of a delegation of Jews, as *ἀπόστολος αὐτῶν*." This, if true, would go far to destroy his own theory. What Josephus says is that a Jewish embassy had arrived in Rome, Varus (the Roman Governor of Syria) having permitted that nation *τόν ἀπόστολον αὐτῶν*—"to commission them."

memory of them before writing as he did. It might seem at first sight curious that, knowing them, he should have committed himself to Lake's highly improbable conjecture. But that is in line with a general view of early Christian history, and the relative importance in the formative "Apostolic" period of Hellenism and Judaism, which leads always to similar contradictions of the evidence. Bousset argued that "the Greek-speaking Church of Antioch" first gave the title "Lord" to Jesus, despite the formula "Maranatha." Streeter argued that the same church inaugurated mon-episcopacy, despite St James at Jerusalem. Lake "argued strongly" that the same church "hit on" the Christian Apostolate (presumably from its study of Herodotus), despite the evidence of the LXX. Others have argued that the same church invented the equation of the eucharistic chalice with our Lord's Blood, but we need not go into that again now. For all their freedom, "Liberal" scholars are apt to process along their party-line with a stately precision. If Dr Hunkin could bring himself to think of the Church of Antioch as a body founded and led by devout Jews from Jerusalem who spoke Greek, he might understand why, even when it came to include Gentiles, it did not become a hot-bed of almost conscious syncretism. And that, in turn, would make the study of Christian origins less paradoxical than he seems to find it.

(4) Dr Hunkin complains that I do not "refer to A. Harnack's interesting examination of the evidence in *Mission und Ausbreitung*, ed. 4, pp. 340*ff.*" I think I can show that I knew of it. But the evidence has greatly increased in the generation since Harnack wrote, and his main points are included in Rengstorf's much fuller and more recent discussion, to which I did give a reference, of which Dr Hunkin does not seem to have been able to avail himself. I note, however, (i) that Dr Hunkin found this chapter of Harnack's "interesting"; (ii) that he gives exactly the same incomplete reference as is given by Lake; (iii) that, after reading with interest Harnack's five pages of solid factual argument for the existence of an *Amt* or *Institution* of the *shaliachate* in first-century Judaism and its connexion with the Christian "Apostolate," Dr Hunkin has stated categorically that precisely the same thesis has "*no* historical justification" when put forward by me. This is surprising.

(5) I must desert Dr Hunkin's text for a moment to draw his attention to a real and serious omission from the bibliography of my essay which he has refrained from mentioning. I neglected two important articles by H. Vogelstein: *Die Enstehung und Entwicklung das Apostolats im Judentum* in the *Monatsschrift f. Gesch. u. Wiss. des Judentums*, xlix (1905), pp. 427-449; and *The Development of the Apostolate in Judaism and its Transformation in Christianity* in the *Hebrew Union College Annual II* (1925), pp. 99-123. The reason why I did not mention them was ignorance; I did not know of them.[1]

[1] I learned of their existence from a penetrating criticism of my essay by the Rev. H. E. W. Turner of Lincoln College, Oxford, in *Laudate*, and I agree with his estimate of the value of Vogelstein's article. Since these are hard to come by, it may be useful to say that I have found an excellent abstract of them by F. Gavin in the *Anglican Theological Review* (1927-28), ix, pp. 250-259.

Briefly, Vogelstein's conclusions are: (i) That *shalach* and *shaliach* are found in the technical sense we are discussing in the Jewish literature of the fourth century B.C. *Shalach* (in this sense) involves the *authorization* of an official with a commission to act away from the central authority. The *shaliach* had, as Vogelstein shows, a *Gerichtsbezirk*. (ii) That different verbs were employed for the appointment of a *shaliach* and an ordinary messenger. One "*made*" a *shaliach*, but "sent" a messenger. (iii) That "in Judaism the Apostolate was taken over from the Persian State administration." (iv) That the *Apostels* of the Jewish "central authority" (*Zentralbehörde*) were equipped with letters of authority (*rishaiyon* or *r'shuth*) as early as the time of Ezra.

As I shall make some use of this evidence before I end, it is only fair to Dr Hunkin to make it clear that I did not know of it when I wrote the essay he is criticizing.

(6) Dr Hunkin has correctly reproduced Dr Danby's translations from the Mishnah, though his own commentary offers matter for discussion.[1] But I will concentrate now on *Yoma*, i, 5: "The elders of the Court (*i.e.* the Great Sanhedrin) . . . said to (the High Priest) 'My Lord High Priest, we are *delegates* of the Court and thou art our *delegate* and the *delegate* of the Court.'" So Dr Hunkin. But for *delegates* in the first place the Hebrew text has *shaluchin*, in the second *shaluchenu*, and in the third *shaliach*. Dr Hunkin ignores the difference between the first two and the third. Yet Dr L. Ginsberg, one of the most learned of living Jewish Talmudists, has gone so far as to say of this particular text that "The whole point of the passage rests on a fundamental distinction between a delegate with limited jurisdiction (*shaluach*) and one with plenipotentiary[2] powers (*shaliach*)."[3]

Dr Hunkin concludes from his examination of the six passages from the Mishnah which he cites that "*shaliach* is not a technical term; it represents no formal 'institution'; it simply means 'agent' or 'representative,' with a connotation varying with the context in which it is found." I suggest that he look again at the evidence which he has cited, not only *Yoma*, i, 5, but all of it. If, *e.g.*, "a man may betrothe a woman either by his own act or that of his *shaliach*" (*Kidd*, ii, 1), and a man or woman may similarly divorce their spouse either personally or by a *shaliach* (*Gittin*, iii, 6), then *is it true*, in view of the known formalism of Jewish legal procedure, to say that there is no "institution" of the *shaliach* in Judaism? Doubtless the formalities about the appointment of the *shaliach* of a private person are likely to have been less rigid than those about the appointment of a *shaliach* of the government; the same is true of "representatives" in modern English life. Nevertheless, there is this in common to all the instances of *shaliachate*, public and private, which he produces, that the action of a duly authorized *shaliach* commits his principal irrevocably. It has the full legal or spiritual consequences of an act of the principal

[1] *E.g.*, if he will read Gavin, *Anglican Theological Review*, ix, pp. 254-255, Dr Hunkin will probably wish to modify what he has said about the *shaliach zibbus* mentioned in *Barakoth*, v. 5. [2] *Sic.* [3] Cited, F. Gavin, *art. cit.*, p. 253.

himself. "A man's *shaliach* is as it were himself." Once that is agreed it makes no difference whether we translate it as "agent" or "plenipotentiary."

Doubtless it was a recognition of these (and other) facts which led Rengstorf to head the fullest modern treatment of the subject *Das spätjudische Rechtsinstitut des Shaliachs*;[1] and which has caused scholars, Christian and Jewish, of the calibre of Harnack and Ginsberg, Gavin and Krauss, Vogelstein and Kaufmann Kohler, all to speak of the *shaliachate* in terms of "official appointment," *amt*, *institut*, "plenipotentiary" and *offiziel mandatar*, of "technical sense" and "technical vocabulary." Dr Hunkin's quarrel about terms is not with me, but with the whole modern scholarly investigation of the subject. I am driven to wonder, does he understand just how much he pretends to have dismissed in a single sentence?

(7) We are ready now, I think, for the general issue as it concerns the N.T. "Apostolate." Here is Dr Hunkin's concluding summary:

"At this point again Dom Gregory Dix is going beyond the evidence. 'There were,' he states, 'Jewish "apostles" of the high priest and sanhedrin.' Very likely there were messengers of some sort, but whether they were called *apostoloi* is uncertain, and that they were *plenipotentiaries* is unlikely. And these are precisely the points at issue. But we need pursue Dom Gregory Dix's 'institution' of *plenipotentiary* no further. He has crystallized a custom (that of authorizing an agent or delegate) into a formal 'institution,' as if there had been a *shaliachate*; and for this there is no historical justification."

Beside this I set a paragraph from my essay:

"There were Jewish 'apostles' of the high priest and sanhedrin, and later of the Jewish patriarchs of Jamnia, who were 'ordained' with a laying on of hands, and dispatched on their missions in pairs. A Jewish congregation also could appoint a *shaliach* to represent it before God or men. But it was above all in the intercourse of private men that the institution was well known, giving rise to the rabbinic adage cited no less than nine times in the Talmud: 'A man's *shaliach* is as it were himself' (or 'like himself'). It was therefore a well-known Jewish institution of which our Lord made use in the foundation of His Church." (*Ap. M.*, p. 229.)

I wrote this some five years ago. If I were writing it now, I should wish to say "were sometimes despatched on their missions in pairs" in the first sentence, and to change "nine" to "ten" in the last sentence but one. Otherwise I should not wish to change it. (I speak only of this particular paragraph.) Here is the outline of an "historical justification" for it.

(*a*) As early as the fourth century B.C. there were travelling officials of the Jewish central government known as *shelihim*, who received a letter of commission (*rishaiyon*) appointing them to exercise authority away from the centre of government, either for particular purposes or in discretionary terms. *Ἀπόστολος* and *ἀποστέλλειν* are the LXX translations of *shaliach* and *shalach* used in this technical sense. After A.D. 70

[1] Ap. Kittel, *Wörterbuch*, i, p. 414.

shelihim of the Patriarchs are found with the same official standing, wide powers and letters of commission. It is certain that in the fourth century A.D. they were officially styled *ἀπόστολοι*. Justin (*Dial.* 108) refers to their 'ordination' in the first century A.D., but does not call them *ἀπόστολοι*.

(*b*) It is questioned whether such officials existed in the first century A.D. The title *ἀπόστολοι* is not found in this period in the fragmentary extant evidence. But the office is found before and after, apparently with the same title. It is very unlikely that the Jews of the Jamnia period would have revived an obsolete title and office after the Christian "Apostles" had caused so much damage and scandal to Judaism. It is still more unlikely that they would have gone out of their way to create a wholly *new* office and *title* in imitation of the Christian "apostolate." And we have definite evidence that the *office* at least continued to exist in Judaism in the first century A.D. Saul of Tarsus approached the high priest for "letters" to the synagogues at Damascus (a *rishaiyon*) authorizing him to arrest any Christian heretics he might find there (Acts ix, 2). The letters were issued by the high priest and sanhedrin (Acts xxii, 5). In this they acted not in their civil capacity, since Damascus was outside the secular jurisdiction allowed them by the Romans, but as the supreme religious authority of Judaism. Saul was not a mere "messenger of some sort." He had, he says, *ἐξουσία καὶ ἐπιτροπή*—"the authority and commission of the chief priests" (Acts xxvi, 12)—for the severe disciplinary measures over Jews in the *diaspora* entrusted to his discretion. Whether he had the title "apostle" or not, he had, as Harnack rightly saw, the functions and status of a Jewish "apostle" before he became an "apostle" of Christ. Harnack further argued at length in his *Mission und Ausbreitung* that St Paul afterwards accepted the troublesome charge of the "collection" for Jerusalem, chiefly because such financial superintendence of collections for Jerusalem in the *diaspora* was then one of the recognized duties of the Jewish apostolate, though the transmission of the money was the business of envoys of the local Jewish colonies.

(*c*) Where did the Christian "Apostolate" come from? All the evidence points to both office and title having a Jewish and not a Greek origin. It is certain that before the conversion of St Paul the primitive Church at Jerusalem recognized that the "Eleven" had a special relation to Jesus, which that Church expressed in terms of the contemporary Jewish institution of the *shaliach*. This means, in Jewish conceptions, that the commission must have been supposed to have been given to them by Jesus Himself. St Paul later had strong reasons for challenging this fact if there was the slightest doubt about the matter. But he never questioned it, and represents himself as accepting from their first meeting the commissioning of the Eleven as *shelihim* of Jesus (Gal. i, 17-19). All that he claimed was that his own commission was the same as theirs—"Apostolic" and "from Jesus Christ." The correctness of this view of the *shaliach* nature of the commission of Jesus to the Twelve is supported by the language of Mark iii, 14, which uses the technical Jewish term in a quite un-Greek way: "And He *made* twelve that they might be with Him and He might *send*

them . . ." Kirsopp Lake reveals in a footnote that "Prof. Burkitt points out to me that it is worthy of note 'that the best attested claim made about himself by Jesus is that He was one 'sent.' See Mk. ix, 37; Lk. iv, 18; Mt. xv, 24; Jn. v, 38, etc." (*Not. cit.*, p. 47.) It is inevitable that beside these we should place Jn. xx, 21: "*As* (καθώς) the Father hath sent me, I also send you." This does not mean that they are authorized to do anything they may please. "I came not to do mine own will but the will of Him that sent Me" (Jn. vi, 38), and "the Apostle is not greater than Him that sent him" (Jn. xiii, 16). So the Rabbis laid it down that the authority of the *shaliach* cannot surpass that of his authorizer, but is equal to it.[1] The (later) Jewish document can hardly be quoting the Gospel. Both must be based on the normal Jewish conception and practice of the first century.

No one, certainly not I, would maintain that there was nothing in the Christian "Apostolate" which had not previously been found in the Jewish *shaliachate*. It was not only that new and unexampled powers were added, *e.g.* that of forgiving sins, or even that a new source of empowering, the gift of the Spirit, replaced the old legal conception.[2] The Christian *shaliach* was the personal "representative," the fully empowered "agent" of Jesus, who was "sent" not to reproduce or even to reform Judaism, but to "fulfil" it. By that very fact the *shaliachate* was bound to be transformed. Nevertheless, the Jewish institution has a very real connexion with the "Apostolate" of the New Dispensation. It explains its fundamental character and some of its peculiarities. It was the prepared foundation of which our Lord made use in creating the primary institution of the New Israel.

Thinking chiefly of John xiii, 16 and xx, 21, I had written: "As Jesus, the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, is the *shaliach* and plenipotentiary of God, so after His Ascension the Twelve are His plenipotentiaries, empowered like Him by the Messianic Spirit, to fulfil and continue His own Messianic Mission" (*Ap. M.*, p. 230). I called this "the evangelical view"—and it is certainly that of the Fourth Evangelist. But Dr Hunkin commented: "The *shaliach*—the plenipotentiary, surely a most unfortunate word. Our Divine Lord has no plenipotentiaries on earth. The idea that he ever could have has been one of the besetting illusions of the Catholic Church." Our disagreement must needs have been far more painful to me than to Dr. Hunkin, because he bears the commission of the *shaliach*. But we seem to be agreed at least as to what the Catholic Church has continually taught about this matter, even though he appears to be trying to teach something else. Perhaps, after all, he did learn something from those essays of my colleagues which he has dismissed with less than courtesy.

Gregory Dix, O.S.B.

[1] *Kiddushin*, 42*b*.

[2] There are signs (*e.g.* the χειροτονία) that this had at least been adumbrated in Judaism. We must beware of reading a modern "secularist" interpretation into even the civil institutions of the People of God; there was no such sharp dichotomy in the ancient world. Nevertheless, the Jewish *shaliachate* has a legal and constitutional, rather than a specifically religious background.

Why You Should Read It—XII

IZAAK WALTON'S *LIVES*

THERE are few writers who have so endeared themselves to succeeding generations as the author of *The Compleat Angler*; the pertinacity with which we have retained the original spelling of the title tells its own tale. And yet one wonders how much "honest Izaak" is read today. Is he, perhaps, one of those "classical writers," like Dryden and Ben Jonson, whose names are familiar to all, whose reputations have their honoured place in the manuals of literature, but who are not felt to have much to say of relevance to the common reader in the twentieth century? And how far (supposing I am right) is this opinion justified?

Certainly the temper of Walton's writings is very far removed from that of anything which is being written today, or indeed of anything that has been written during the last hundred years. Open *The Compleat Angler*, and you escape into an Arcadia; time seems to stand still, the waters of "sedgy Lea" float silently by, and the shepherd is piping from a distant hillside "as though he should never be old." The noise and tumult of the outside world never penetrate into this pastoral paradise. If the modern critic wants a perfect example of what he calls "escapist literature," it is to *The Compleat Angler* that he will turn. And he will probably be very rude about it.

It is not my province in this essay to defend Walton's masterpiece against such attacks. *The Compleat Angler* is not Walton's only book; and it is with his other and perhaps more serious production, the *Lives*, that I am now concerned. And here, though Walton's tone is the same—calm, contemplative, deliciously fresh and natural—his subject, or rather his five subjects taken as one, leads him into the discussion of a period of our history which bears peculiar affinities with the present day. As Prof. Bush has pointed out in the introduction to his admirable *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century*, this period has special claims to be called an age of transition. It was an age when all our institutions were in the melting pot: when the new science was conquering fresh fields every day, when the conception of the monarchy was being modified by every force of violence and guile, when the Church was driven underground and emerged to a new life, when literature was developing towards the rationalism of the Enlightenment. It is a period of enormous interest. And if there is any foundation for the belief that the present can learn from the past (which is surely the justification of the study of history), then we today can look back at the seventeenth century with profit. The tortured poems of John Donne, the metaphysical speculations of Sir Thomas Browne, the practical experiment in communal life made by Nicholas Ferrar at Little Gidding—all these have something to say to us.

Izaak Walton's long life almost spans this period of transition. He was born in 1593, the year when George Herbert too first saw the light; Queen Elizabeth was on the throne, and the memory of the great deliverance of 1588 was still in all men's minds. He lived through the reign of James I and shared the general horror when the

Gunpowder Plot was discovered. About this early period of his life little or nothing is known. He was of humble parentage; he did not enter at either of the universities; but that he must have cultivated an early interest in literature is clear from the dedication to him in 1619 of a poem, "The Love of Amos and Laura," which was first published in 1613 and written, we are told, under Walton's encouragement. We know that at some date before 1624 Walton was already in business in Fleet Street as a linen draper; and this business he carried on with good success up to 1644. During this period of his life he became friendly with the great Dr John Donne, Dean of St Paul's since 1621, who had been appointed Vicar of Walton's own parish, St Dunstan's in the West, in 1624. It speaks highly for Walton's personality that he should have gained the esteem of perhaps the keenest intellect of the age; and that Donne should have introduced him to Sir Henry Wotton, who also became his lifelong friend. This marked the beginning of an ever-growing circle of friendship, which came to include Bishop Sanderson, Drayton, Ben Jonson, Chillingworth, Hales of Eton, the historian Charles Cotton, and Archbishop Sheldon. These were all men prominent in Church and State; and through long and intimate companionship with them Walton came to be fully versed in all the questions which agitated the age.

On March 31, 1631, Donne died; and Wotton followed eight years after. It was a period of bereavements for Walton. He had married in 1626 Rachel Floud, a great-grandniece of Archbishop Cranmer; she bore him two sons and a daughter. But between 1632 and 1640 mother and children all died, and Walton was left alone. And with the development of civil strife public anxieties were added to private ones for Walton. He was a convinced Royalist, and it is certain that he found life in fanatically Parliamentarian London difficult and even dangerous. The narratives of the *Lives* are full of vivid glimpses of those times. We hear the raging of the mob that howled for Strafford's blood, and Laud's; we see Sanderson in his quiet country rectory, one of the greatest scholars and one of the best men of his age, badgered by an illiterate soldiery—"for the soldiers would appear, and visibly disturb him in the Church when he read prayers, pretending to advise him how God was to be served most acceptably: which he not approving, but continuing to observe order and decent behaviour in reading the Church-service, they forced his book from him, and tore it, expecting extemporary prayers."

Yet it was during this period of public calamity and private grief that Walton published the first two of the *Lives*. "It is not without some little wonder at myself," he writes, "that I am come to be publicly in print. And though I have in these introductions declared some of the accidental reasons that occasioned me to be so, yet let me add this to what is there said, that by my undertaking to collect some notes for Sir Henry Wotton's writing the Life of Dr Donne, and by Sir Henry Wotton's dying before he performed it, I became like those men that enter easily into a lawsuit or a quarrel, and having begun, cannot make a fair retreat and be quiet, when they desire it. And really, after such a manner, I became engaged into a necessity of

writing the Life of Dr Donne, contrary to my first intentions; and that begot a like necessity of writing the Life of his and my ever-honoured friend, Sir Henry Wotton."

The spirit of Walton breathes in these few introductory sentences: his modesty (". . . when I sometimes look back upon my education and mean abilities . . ."), his quiet humour, his friendliness—and, above all, the delightful, easy flow of his style, the purity of his vocabulary. It is the quintessence of conversational prose. Walton writes as he talked: gently, without undue emphasis, but with an eye for subtle shades and delicate distinctions.

It was, of course, difficult to write bad prose in the seventeenth century. Writers rarely strove for effect, and they had behind them the powerful influence of the Authorized Version and the Common Prayer; they were unprofessional authors, not "men of letters": what they were concerned for was not a literary reputation but the encouragement of truth or the explanation of the rules of some art or science. Sir Thomas Browne the physician, Sir Francis Bacon the philosopher, Burton the Anatomist, Bunyan the amateur theologian: all of them were writing not literature but wisdom. That the wisdom turned out to be literature was an accident of genius. After the seventeenth century, of course, sophistication set in, both in prose and poetry; there was a deliberate aiming at effect, and a consequent elimination of spontaneity. Blake, we may say, was the last great writer who kept his eye on the end and not on the means.

And here we have Izaak Walton ambling into his subject. It is the beginning of the prefatory letter to the Bishop of Winchester. "My Lord, I did some years past present you with a plain relation of the Life of Mr Richard Hooker, that humble man, to whose memory Princes and the most learned of this nation have paid a reverence at the mention of his name." It is utterly unselfconscious prose, the style of a man talking to his friend; and the *Lives* themselves are like that too. Of course, he loses a lot of the depths and of the shades. The simple, childlike mind of Walton was not equipped to deal adequately with the complex, tortured spirit of Donne, or even with the paradoxes of Herbert's subtle imagination. The figures come to us flattened out, as it were; but what is given is given with inimitable charm. What more disarming, for instance, than this pious exordium to Walton's account of Donne's taking Holy Orders:

> It hath been observed by wise and considering men, that wealth hath seldom been the portion, and never the mark to discover good people; but that Almighty God, who disposeth all things wisely, hath of his abundant goodness denied it—He only knows why—to many, whose minds he hath enriched with the greater blessings of knowledge and virtue, as the fairer testimonies of his love to mankind: and this was the present condition of this man of so excellent erudition and endowments; whose necessary and daily expenses were hardly reconcilable with his uncertain and narrow estate. Which I mention, for that at this time, there was a most generous offer made him for the moderating of his worldly cares; the declaration of which shall be the next employment of my pen.

The whole flavour of that musical century, again, breathes in the following comparison. Walton has been telling us of a strange vision

Donne once saw on an occasion when he was away from home. "I have seen a dreadful vision since I saw you (such are the words Walton puts into his mouth). I have seen my dear wife pass twice by me through this room, with her hair hanging about her shoulders, and a dead child in her arms: this I have seen since I saw you." And the vision turned out to be true; Mrs Donne had been delivered of a dead child. Here is Walton's comment, romantic, delighting in the marvellous, poised to wonder and to admire:

> This is a relation that will beget some wonder, and it well may; for most of our world are at present possessed with an opinion, that Visions and Miracles are ceased. And, though it is most certain, that two lutes being both strung and tuned to an equal pitch, and then one played upon, the other, that is not touched, being laid upon a table at a fit distance, will—like an echo to a trumpet—warble a faint audible harmony in answer to the same tune; yet many will not believe there is any such thing as a sympathy of souls; and I am well pleased, that every reader do enjoy his own opinion. But if the unbelieving will not allow the believing reader of this story, a liberty to believe that it may be true; then I wish him to consider, many wise men have believed that the ghost of Julius Cæsar did appear to Brutus, and that both St Austin, and Monica his mother, had visions in order to his conversion.

Yes, this side of the seventeenth century, too, comes out in Walton's narratives: the marvellous, the speculative, the credulous; and it is a side we do well not to forget. In our vision of the "century of genius," as Prof. Whitehead has rightly called it, the great progressive figures like Locke and Bacon and Newton are apt to take up more space than they deserve if we are to see the period as a whole. For these men were the exceptions: they had little effect on the general world-picture of their own day, which was still largely governed by Ptolemy's *Almagest* and the *Three Books of Occult Philosophy* of Cornelius Agrippa.

Thus, in his *Life of Sir Henry Wotton*, Walton again adverts to the topic of prophetic dreams, believing "that Almighty God . . . hath even in these latter times also by a certain illumination of the soul in sleep discovered many things that human wisdom could not foresee"; and retails a marvellous story about Sir Henry's great-uncle, and another about his father; thus adding colour to his narrative and giving glory to God at the same time.

Very easily in these suave biographies the supernatural spills over into the spiritual, the marvellous fades away into a starry devotion, and the piety of an age is recreated before our eyes. The *Life of George Herbert* will impress us at first by its simplicity, its spontaneity of touch; but before long we may find ourselves exclaiming, as Goethe exclaimed at Marlowe's *Dr Faustus*, "How greatly it is all planned." For behind the deceptive naivety we feel Walton linking his threads together, assembling his characters, managing his situations with a masterly hand. Of all the *Lives*, this is the one which remains in our memories as an artistic whole. For here Walton seizes upon his opportunity: he will take the life of one seventeenth-century poet, and he will elaborate it, he will draw it out in all its implications, and biography will be transmuted to symbolism. Nowhere does he step from the narrow track of veracity, nowhere does he exaggerate or suppress—we

are sure of that; but he exercises the privilege of an artist, and he mixes the colours and the shades according to *his* proportions. Thus the *Life of Herbert* becomes a pageant, almost a masque, from which no essential ingredient of colour, music or dance is lacking. The great stately figures pace before our eyes—John Donne, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, Magdalen Herbert, Ferrar of Gidding, and Lancelot Andrewes. Less stately, but more sharply defined, we have Herbert himself. First, at Cambridge: "if during his time he expressed any error, it was, that he kept himself too much retired, and at too great a distance with all his inferiors; and his clothes seemed to prove that he put too great a value on his parts and parentage." Then at Bemerton (he "had changed his word and silk clothes into a canonical coat"), he no longer keeps himself so retired; for, walking over to Salisbury one day, "he saw a poor man with a poorer horse, that was fallen under his load: they were both in distress, and needed present help; which Mr Herbert perceiving, put off his canonical coat, and helped the poor man to unload, and after to load, his horse." For once Walton is giving us, not a hagiography, but a drama; we see the personality of Herbert developing before our eyes as his life moves to its quiet close, and gathering up into itself all the manifold religious and intellectual threads of the age.

This, I think, constitutes the permanent value of Walton's book. It is more than a collection of memoirs, charming though these are. It is the imaginative recreation of a civilization—a civilization long past, it is true, but from which we may still learn something of the art of living. Walton moves through it all with well-bred ease and describes it with mastery. We get closer to the heart of the seventeenth century in his book than in all the manuals of history.

BERNARD BLACKSTONE.

Studies In Texts

ROMANS IX, 5

THE two little words *ὁ ὤν* should be equated with the passage in Revelation i, 6. Paul is desirous of showing the identity of our Lord with the "Jahve, great I AM" of Exodus iii, 14, *ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ ὤν*=the ever existent One. I would venture to punctuate the passage thus: *ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα—Ὁ Ὤν, ἐπὶ πάντων, Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.* For a justification for applying the words to *Christ*, *cf.* Colossians i, 16-19; ii, 9 (for *ἐπὶ=ἐπάνω* see John iii, 31). One might add to these quotations 2 Corinthians xi, 31: *ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὁ ὤν, εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.* There occurs in Isaiah xlv, 19 (LXX) a striking phrase to illustrate the O.T. background of *ὁ ὤν*: *ἐγώ εἰμι. . . . Κύριος ὁ λαλῶν δικαιοσύνην.* The accumulation of epithets in the Romans passage should cause no difficulty; we have a good parallel in Isaiah ix, 6 (the Child will prove to be) "Wonderful, Counsellor, Hero-God, Father for ever, Prince of peace." Compare also our Lord's own words in John viii, 58: *πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι* (came into being) *Ἐγὼ εἰμί.*

E. H. BLAKENEY.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Miss Charles is the author of *The Jews and Palestine*, etc.

Dom Gregory Dix, O.S.B., is a monk of Nashdom Abbey.

Dr Blackstone is a lecturer at University College, Swansea; he is the author of *The Ferrar Papers*.

Mr Blakeney is the author of *The Epistle of Diognetus*, etc.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE LAND AND SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I am indebted to Mr Bourne's letter drawing attention to what seems to have been a misleading, perhaps erroneous, statement in my article. Though I am grateful to him for showing that both St Augustine and St Thomas Aquinas do sometimes consider nature and grace in favourable association, I am not sure that the few isolated quotations he gives (interesting as they are) are sufficient to show that neither of them were dualists of a kind. It is not merely a matter of showing that nature and grace are not antithetical; they have some kind of interconnexion for almost all Christian theology. What I suggest is that this interconnexion is a *purposeful* correlation, which even my all too slight knowledge of both Augustine and Aquinas leads me to think they do not take into account sufficiently. Am I wrong in supposing that to both these writers nature does not matter very much, that it is almost, if not quite, irrelevant because grace is so much more important? Just because grace is so important, I suggest, we can only reach an understanding of its true significance in and through nature. Hence the *purposeful* correlation.

To gain what I perceive to be the right approach to sacramentalism, the breaking down of opposing tensions is not enough, working agreement is not enough. Only a unity of apprehension—two concepts but one meaning—is really sufficient. This seems to me the underlying theme in biblical revelation which has got lost to a very great extent, in subsequent theology, which, even if it has not pronounced an outright divorce, has taken a delight in a judicial, philosophical and subtle, yet utterly unbiblical separation. A breach which I am delighted to feel Mr Bourne is as anxious to see healed as I am.

Yours,

W. S. BOYCOTT.

EWEN FARM HOUSE,
NEAR CIRENCESTER.
April 25, 1948.

"THE CHURCH AND THE ATOM"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The moral and political unrealism of the "Church and the Atom" report is really frightening. The resuscitation at this hour of

the medieval category of the "just war" is as pathetic as the attempt to combat the rising commercialism of the sixteenth century by simply reissuing the teaching of the "just price." Archdeacon Harthill's quotation of Prof. Tawney's judgment on the latter is irresistibly apt. "The social theory of the Church of England turned its face from the practical world to pore over doctrines which, had their original authors been as impervious to realities as their later exponents, would never have been formulated. Naturally it was shouldered aside. It was neglected, because it had become negligible."

The theory of the just war is, as the report says, "governed by the principle that war itself is a legal process for the enforcement of rights." That anyone can believe this of modern war is quite incredible. War is precisely what occurs because there is no legal process for the enforcement of international rights, so that the combatants take the law into their own hands and resort to the arbitrament of force. A war may be fought for justice, but in any relevant circumstances it cannot be an act of justice. The question, therefore, is not: Can an atomic war be just? But, Can it ever be justified, can the frightful evils of such an act ever be less than those of its alternative?

To state it thus at least delivers us from the appalling moral abdication of having as Christians to hold with the committee (1) that warfare is perfectly just (and Christian?) which obeys the rules and only slaughters combatants in a "clean" way; and (2) that atomic warfare breaks all the rules, but by the convenient "doctrine of necessity" can be blessed for use in any way most efficacious in any state of "present imminent danger." It is precisely such casuistry by which naked expediency is dressed up to justify what is admitted to be wrong which has discredited traditional moral theology in the eyes of the ordinary man. He may not be equal to many subtleties, but he knows hypocrisy when he sees it.

The public at large must now be finally convinced that it is futile to expect any lead from the Church of England on the subject of war, and the work of the parish priest is thereby made that much the more impossible. But the parish priest himself has equal cause for dismay. Is he really to believe that this report represents, as it claims to, "the distinctive approach of Anglican thought and theology," a report which contrives to discuss the whole Christian attitude to the morality of war without a single reference to the New Testament or the teaching of Christ? The outlook underlying the British Council of Churches' report, *The Era of Atomic Power*, at least showed signs of having taken account of the theological thinking and world facts of the last thirty years. One wonders whether this committee (or should one say the theological minority who seem to have captured it?) has really faced anything that has been thought or done in the last three hundred.

Yours sincerely,

John Robinson.

St Leonard's Vicarage,
Parkfield Avenue, Bristol 5.

May 5, 1948.

"CATHOLICITY"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The pamphlet *Catholicity* raises questions which concern the future of the ecumenical conversation. The attempt "by a group of Anglicans of the 'Catholic' school of thought" to "consider whether any synthesis between Catholicism and Protestantism is possible," was well worth making. The learned authors have produced a piece of solid and sustained argument which deserves serious and patient consideration. They have made an honest attempt to do justice to traditions most distant from their own, and have perhaps succeeded better in this than any previous writing from their quarter. These things constitute an important contribution to that genuine ecumenicity which they have carefully defined (pp. 32, 44-45).

Nevertheless, as one ponders "Where do we go from here?" one is conscious of danger. Is the ecumenical conversation to proceed, taking us further along the road to catholicity and "wholeness," or are we to split up along our various sectarian by-ways which lead to what Masson aptly labelled "Amsterdamnation," resulting in that very deadlock into the causes of which the authors of *Catholicity* were bidden to examine, and where the real and painful progress of two generations could be lost amid a cry of "To your tents, O Israel"? Much will depend on the documents which are being prepared by a group of Free Churchmen and by a group of Evangelicals as a counterpart to *Catholicity*.

It will be part of their task to examine that "combination of insight with the wearing of blinkers" which in *Catholicity* has resulted in real or alleged misrepresentation of the Protestant tradition. They must not underrate the task. A publisher said of the volume *The Apostolic Ministry* that it took years to prepare, and that those who dislike its conclusions must not imagine they could dash off a reply in a few weeks. Neither that volume nor this pamphlet is really to be met by a series of sniping shots or epigrams, and it would be disastrous if the proper uses of polemical divinity were to degenerate into a theological slanging match. Behind *The Apostolic Ministry* and *Catholicity* lies a coherent interpretation of Christian truth and its development which needs to be met at the highest level of exact historical scholarship and careful theological argument. Really to come to grips about that might bring about a discussion of classic importance, worthy of the great centuries of theological discussion. *Catholicity* issues to Protestants the grand challenge to "Ordeal by History," and it is imperative that the challenge be accepted in soberness and charity.

A Methodist may add one sharp regret. It has been the wisdom of the Church of England to keep the mean between two extremes, but that is not to be numbered among the many virtues of *Catholicity*. Yet one would have hoped from Anglicans something which no other English communion will speak, that has not been said by the authors of this pamphlet, and is perhaps unlikely to come from the Evangelicals. That was a noble high Anglican tradition which claimed to be both Protestant and Catholic and which proudly and gratefully rejoiced in

the rich and positive content of the two traditions. As the debate continues, may we not hope that this voice, or the voices of its descendants, may be heard?

GORDON RUPP.

RICHMOND COLLEGE,
SURREY.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE RUSSIAN IDEA. By Nicholas Berdyaev. Geoffrey Bles. 18s.

It is with sadness that one reflects that the great Berdyaev is dead; that from his profound and gleaming intellect we can look for no more flashes of insight, which illumined not only the problems of our troubled age but the depths of his own mind as well. This volume, however, is a grand, worthy finale. It fittingly crowns a life whose intellectual intensity has been rarely equalled in our generation and, I feel certain, never surpassed. In this book Berdyaev had distilled the quintessence of that Russia which the Bolsheviks have so distorted and caricatured.

The Russian idea is an idea of final destiny. The Russian mind, even in its Marxist degeneration, is burdened and oppressed with the weight of eschatology. This is the theme and variation of Russian thought. All through this book the theme of eschatology runs like a river, sometimes in flood, sometimes disappearing underground only to reappear in fuller spate. The problem of man's final destiny, says Berdyaev, is implicit in the whole tradition of Russian literature from Gogol to Chekov, and even later. It is more than implicit in the Russian philosophers and theologians and mystics. In Russian thinking even the problems of the interim, of the process, become illustrations and exemplifications of the dominant obsession. All problems in the Russian mind lead to eschatology, to the End. Let me give one or two examples.

"The Russian people are a people of the end, and not of the intervening historical process, whereas humanistic culture does belong to the intervening historical process. Russian literature of the nineteenth century, which in common parlance was the greatest manifestation of Russian culture, was not culture in the Western classical sense of the word, and had always passed beyond the frontiers of culture." (p. 129.) "The Russian Idea is an eschatological idea of the Kingdom of God. This is not a humanistic idea in the European sense of the word, but the Russian people are exposed to danger on the one side from an obscurantist rejection of culture instead of an eschatological criticism of it, and on the other side from a mechanical collectivist civilization." (p. 141.) Berdyaev argues that, in a profound sense, the totalitarian collectivism of contemporary Russia is itself an expression of eschatological importance, of a too great passion for "the consummation of all things." This is the source of the Russian tendency to rationalize power as a care for souls. Even Joe Stalin does it, as, for instance, when he defines the writer as "an engineer of souls." "To the Tsar belonged not only care for the interests of the State, but also care for the salvation of souls. Ivan the Terrible was

particularly insistent on this point" (p. 9). Russia will always be impatient with historical process. It is always Russians who have seen culmination round the corner, like Bakunine, who, in Marx's words, was forever mistaking the third month of revolutionary pregnancy for the ninth; and like Lenin, who made the same mistake about Germany in 1919. Then they have to persuade themselves that the process is itself the End—with ghastly consequences.

In the course of formulating this fundamental theme of Russian thought, Berdyaev lights up the whole achievement of Russian culture. He reveals, for instance, the essential contribution of the great Russian literary and philosophical figures. Alexander Herzen—to give an example—assumes the mantle of the prophet, a Dostoevsky reduced to a logical syllogism. He proclaimed "a war of free men against the liberators of mankind." . . . In his remarkable book *From the Other Side* he gave warning that the inward barbarian is coming, and he displayed much foresight in prophesying that life would become harder for the educated minority. "Explain to me, please," he says, "why it is ridiculous to believe in God, but not ridiculous to believe in man? Why is it not ridiculous to believe in humanity? Why is it stupid to believe in the Kingdom of God but intelligent to believe in an earthly utopia?" (p. 63). Why, indeed?

The eschatological character of the Russian mind is evidenced by the work of a philosopher like Fedorer, who, in Berdyaev's judgment, is, at his best, one of the supreme thinkers of the world. (And there isn't a single book of his in English!) His eschatology was conditional, depending upon the humanizing of science and technology (pp. 209-10).

This book of Berdyaev's comes to Western Europe in a sore and trying hour. The complete atheism and inhumanity of the present masters of Russia may easily tempt us to dismiss Russia as only another imperialism with a peculiar ideological twist. Berdyaev in this book reminds us that the problem is far profounder and vaster. Russia today is the projection into history of the whole contradiction of man's fate, and this ought to save us from too facile judgments. A great book!

D. R. Davies.

Brighton.

The Reunion of the Church. By Lesslie Newbigin. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

This work is a theological defence, on a fuller scale than the war of pamphlets which the South India Scheme has evoked recently in full spate, by a busy missionary on furlough. It is attractively written and conceived in a deeply eirenic vein. It is necessarily controversial, but has a deeper objective than mere controversy.

The first twenty-three pages set the stage by a reasoned yet burning description of the pressure no less theological than practical which led to the formation of the South India Scheme and its subsequent inauguration. Part II (pp. 28-123) is the most constructive part of the book—a discussion of the first principles which must underlie any doctrine of the Church, and in particular any theological apology for

the South Indian experiment. Much is well urged and attractively put, but there is little that is new. It is an attempt to make Calvin and Cyprian kiss each other (*cf.* the common quotation, "Those who have God as Father must have the Church as Mother"); but while the author is on firm ground with Calvin, he is naturally more tentative and fumbling in his attempt to enter into the other tradition. There is a full recognition of the necessity for Churchmanship, of the relation between inward and outward, between the spiritual and the corporeal; but the long chapter on the Extension of the Incarnation (devoted, an Anglican is humiliated to discover, not to any Anglican statement of the case, but to Père Congar's *Divided Christendom*) leaves at least one reader uncertain how far the author has really entered sympathetically and with imagination into the views which he is criticizing. It is an excellent example of the sacrifices made by non-Anglicans in entering into the scheme that he must try to make an adventure in understanding on unfamiliar ground. The next chapter, on Justification by Faith, illustrates the corresponding sacrifice which Anglicans must make in the adventure of mutual understanding. Your reviewer may be pardoned for the personal confession that, while more at home than Bishop Newbigin in theological relations between the Incarnation and the Church, he found some difficulty in seeing the relevance to the doctrine of the Church of the preliminary stages of the Pauline theology of the spiritual life. He is now considerably enlightened and somewhat chastened, but he still can see no reason to give this chapter the pride of place in the theological part of the work.

It was a matter of considerable interest to discover the real objections to mutual recommissioning, whether in the form of "supplemental ordination" or in any other form. Practically, your reviewer wonders whether Bishop Newbigin quite realizes the amount of justifiable heart-searching that the acceptance of this proposal would have spared and the store which most Anglicans set upon having an agreed ministry from the very start of the interim period. The statements on page 113 raise a quite extraordinary number of doubts in the mind. Ideally, no doubt, and in principle ordination is to the ministry of the whole Church of God, but surely it is in practice confined to a particular denomination or branch, if you will, of the Church. We have not really reached the full level of our present ordinals. I wonder whether Bishop Newbigin realizes the fact that many Anglicans feel positively estopped from ministering in Free Churches, not merely because we have not—what we should describe *more Anglicano*—a licence to do so, but because we are not accredited to do so, and that the only means known to us of receiving such accrediting is by the laying on of hands. We are as little Free Church ministers as they are Anglican ministers, and it is the gravest weakness of the South India Scheme not to recognize and to provide for this fact. The difficulty that many of us feel about the pledge is not that we fear that it may be inequably administered, but that it should be necessary at all. It introduces an element of doubt where such an element should never be admitted—in the Divine Liturgy. It may well prove to be the rock on which the scheme may founder.

In Part III Bishop Newbigin turns to defend the scheme in some detail. He appeals to the report of the Archbishop's Committee of Theologians, on which your reviewer had the honour to serve as a junior member. He quite legitimately treats the report as "cloud cover" against the wilder sniping of the opposition, but there is not so much recognition of the careful and measured criticism which the report also contained. There is an interesting and well-reasoned criticism of *The Apostolic Ministry* on pages 152-164, though it must be pointed out the Cyprianic doctrine of the ministry does not stand or fall with the doctrine of the *shaliach*! The note on the "exceptional arrangements" involved in lay celebration (pp. 173-176) at last sets in its true light a note in the scheme which had long been felt to be a little coy or domestic in character. Some of us suspected that this was the real background, but it would have helped us to sympathize if we had known more definitely—sympathize, but not necessarily approve or accept. Anglicans are well aware that "where proposals for union between Anglicans and others are being discussed, the position of the Anglican communion naturally cannot be taken as by itself the supreme and decisive standard" (p. 167); but they are at least entitled to ask for a deeper attempt to understand what they (and the Primitive Church no less than the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches) mean by priesthood, and why they set store by the term. No Anglican seriously disputes the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. What many of us Anglicans find it difficult to see is its relevance to the doctrine of the ministry—or at least, to put the point less sharply, the reason why those who proclaim it most earnestly find it of necessity inconsistent with the assertion of a special ministerial priesthood.

The work as a whole calls attention to a lively desire to indulge in an essay of corporate thinking during the next thirty years. (This is a welcome sign.) But it also throws into relief the difficulties which will beset this task. Bishop Newbigin has made an honest and open-hearted beginning, but most Anglicans will commend his courage in seeing the task ahead more heartily than his success in producing the finished product. But that only serves to emphasize the need and the challenge for Anglicans to take up the task, to interpret what we are really getting at to other traditions within the Universal Church and, no less important, to enter as far as we may into what they really mean, prize and value within the storehouse of Christendom. And we may well find that we have on both counts the harder task!

The book is well printed and produced, but on page 23 "dishinity" should, of course, be "disunity," and something has come wildly adrift at the foot of page 127: "it is the essence of all idolatry that it seeks to provide men into grown up and lived under the rule which requires episcopal brought down onto the plane of human society . . ." "All episcopalians are idolaters" might be a tenable thesis, but this suggests the obverse: "all idolaters are episcopalians"—which might be a trifle hard on the idolaters!

H. E. W. Turner.

Lincoln College,
Oxford.

THE MAKING OF SERMONS. By S. P. T. Prideaux. Mowbray. 3s. 6d.

It is reported of Dr Pusey "that although he possessed none of 'the arts and accomplishments of preaching, pliability of voice, command over accent, time and tone'; though he never changed his pace or tone or made a pause, keeping his eyes always on his paper and never looking at his congregation, and reading on the same level all through; yet he was most effective as a preacher, and this was due to his utter reality."

"It is the highly trained theologian who makes the best village preacher, for the reason that he knows just what ought to be said and what may be left out, as well as how to say it."

Canon Prideaux is a bold man to include the above paragraphs in a book on the art of preaching. For, if pushed to logical conclusions, they might convince prospective readers that this, as well as all text-books on homiletics, are really not worth their serious attention. A student preparing himself for the ministry of the Word had better concentrate upon the latest compendium of systematic divinity.

Indeed, many of us as we read (or perhaps even write) the latest volume on preaching must face the question: "Just what good is it, this study of preaching as an *art*?" The problem of the man in the pulpit is "What to preach?" not "How?"

There are nine-and-sixty ways of giving God His praise. We ministers of the Gospel cry out for insight, for the power of Holy Spirit, for the gift of speaking parables, for "homiletic *theology*," even for courage to speak at all, but not for tricks of the trade of pulpit eloquence. The latter are suspect in our days of disillusionment and emergent cynicism. It is precisely the "tricks" of the parson which may have emptied our churches. Does a physician spend his nights reading volumes on the "art" of medicine? Does he not concentrate on medical science itself? The "art," or the "practice," of medicine somehow takes care of itself. Let a physician think too much of his "practice," and he may soon have no patients to "practise" on. Is the Church's ministry less subject to this paradox?

One of the real values of Canon Prideaux's booklet is that the paradox is faced and courageously dealt with. The chapter entitled "The Preacher Himself," from which my opening quotations are taken (pp. 43 and 45), is one of its wisest. This and other chapters argue against trust in homiletic devices and lead on to homiletic *theology*. To be sure, Canon Prideaux's monograph cannot compare in theological depth with some of its rivals in the homiletic field—such books, for example, as P. T. Forsyth's *Positive Preaching and Modern Mind* and H. H. Farmer's recent *Servant of the Word*. Canon Prideaux's advice excels in the more practical, humbler areas of the preacher's vocation. Pointing beyond the art of preaching to the preacher's overarching vocation as guardian of a "What?" rather than a "How?" the booklet, in its own limited field of fatherly counselling of candidates for the ministry, is excellent. It is full of sharp "don'ts"—invaluable, if heeded—and full also of quoted and quotable phrases which are proof of a long professorial garnering of wisdom. A few examples will serve to recommend the book on this score alone. On fluency in

preaching, for example: "It is more dangerous than difficult" (p. 72). In the study of Scripture, "we are to be 'approved money-changers' " (p. 69). When writing sermons "write quickly, in the heat of your desire to deliver your message. Bishop Chavasse used to say: 'Beware of freezing' " (p. 67). The test of a good sermon is not "that people should say 'what a wonderful sermon, or preacher,' but that they should go away quietly and want to be alone" (p. 21). On sympathy with ordinary people as a necessary characteristic of the preacher: "It was said once of a preacher: 'Mr So-and-so speaks as if he was inside of us' " (p. 51).

Books on homiletic science, so it may properly be argued, must be self-denying, or else they may do more harm than good. They must point to the preacher's gospel and not to the preacher himself. Bishop Phillips Brooks coined a dangerous phrase in defining preaching as "the bringing of truth through personality"—dangerous, that is, when the word *personality* is stressed, and not the word *truth*. Yet, when properly guarded against false use, books like this of Canon Prideaux serve a good purpose. Even honest physicians, despising the "practice" of medicine for its own sake, lovingly share with one another the intimacies of experience in the consulting room. Throughout the Church's history there have been Elishas sitting at the feet of Elijahs and learning the "art" of prophesying as well as its message. There is meaning in the word of the title of Canon Prideaux's book—"The *Making* of Sermons." "A man writing a love sonnet," so runs the advice of a critic of poetry, "must not only be in love, but in love with a sonnet."

T. O. Wedel.

College of Preachers,
Washington, D.C.

Ahad Ha-Am: Essays, Letters, Memoirs. Translated from the Hebrew and edited by Leon Simon. East and West Library. 12s. 6d.

Anyone seeking to understand the spirit of modern Jewry must sooner or later come across the name of Asher Ginzberg, or, to give him the pen name by which he is now invariably known, *Ahad Ha-Am* ("One of the People"). It is not surprising, therefore, to find amongst the first five books of the Philosophia Judaica section of the East and West Library a selection of the essays, letters and memoirs of this important figure. At the same time it is a matter of some satisfaction that the present volume gives such a representative collection of his writings, and that the translator and editor is Sir Leon Simon, Chairman of the Council of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, and a devoted disciple and close friend of Ahad Ha-Am. Sir Leon has previously produced two volumes of Ahad Ha-Am's essays in translation (*Selected Essays*, 1912, and *Ten Essays on Zionism and Judaism*, 1922), but this is a completely new presentation, containing much material that has not appeared before in English and drastic revisions, amounting "in some cases to the extent of complete re-writing," of what has already been published.

There is no doubt that it is as a Zionist thinker, and "not only as a Zionist thinker, but as *the* Zionist thinker," that Ahad-Ha-Am is chiefly eminent, and in times when Zionism forces itself upon the attention of all, Jew and non-Jew alike, it is important that his contribution to the understanding of this contemporary phenomenon should be readily available. Although much of what he wrote was written a generation or more ago, his contribution is as apposite and significant now as then. It is interesting to note how, in spite of the fact that "throughout his years of activity as a Hebrew writer he was an unsparing critic of the prevailing tendencies of thought and policy in Zionism," nevertheless "his thought has worked itself to a quite extraordinary extent into the texture of Zionist ideology. Many of his ideas have become current Zionist coin . . ." In view of the fact that the first of Sir Leon's earlier volumes is published only in America and that the second is out of print, it seems a pity that this collection does not include some of those revealing sayings of Ahad Ha-Am recently quoted in Walter Zander's *Is this the Way?* (Gollancz, 1948). Ahad Ha-Am stood for "spiritual Zionism" and looked to Palestine as a "spiritual centre" for Judaism, but in order to see what precisely he meant by these terms it is necessary to consult his writings. As these are without exception in Hebrew, the non-Hebrew reading public must be greatly indebted to Sir Leon Simon for his translations.

Suffice it to add that there is also much else here of interest and importance in relation to the many problems of modern Jewish culture in the world of today. Clearly, this is a book which should find its way into all public libraries and into many private libraries too.

C. Witton-Davies.

Jerusalem.

The Book of Psalms in Latin and English. Translated by R. A. Knox. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 12s. 6d.

The translation of liturgical matter from one language to another is notoriously hazardous, and he is a brave man who will attempt it. Mgr Knox has already proved his mettle in his valuable translation of the New Testament. But the Psalms are a different proposition, if only because they are poetry and a part of our prayers.

The neat little book before us contains in fact two fresh translations. For the Latin on the left-hand page gives us the first publication in England of the new translation of the Psalms made by the Pontifical Biblical Institute at Rome, and authorized by the Pope for experimental use in place of the Vulgate translation in the Breviary. Taken direct from the Hebrew, like our own, it is therefore noticeably nearer in meaning to our English Prayer Book Version than is Jerome's, based mainly on the Greek. We gather that this new Latin version has its critics among the Roman clergy, and not only for its unfamiliarity. The language is undoubtedly more classical, but Christian Latin has its own history of a millennium and a half, and its own shades of meaning and association. Certainly, to find *Exspectans exspectavi* and *In exitu Israel* replaced by *Speravi, Speravi* and *Cum exiret Israel* is something of a shock even to an Anglican.

Mgr Knox's English version is, as we might expect, graceful, modern and polished, if at times a trifle rhetorical in its use of inversions, exclamations and rhetorical questions. Frequently he gives a paraphrase rather than direct translation and, less understandably, often fails to retain the beauty, well represented in the new Latin, of the Hebrew parallelism. It is curious, however, to note how even his felicitous and idiomatic English compares unfavourably in dignity, and even in directness and simplicity, with the 400-year-old version of Coverdale. Thus, to illustrate by one example, the opening verses of Ps. 115 (by our reckoning) run in the new Latin:

> Non nobis, Domine, non nobis
> sed nomini tuo da gloriam,
> propter misericordiam tuam, propter fidelitatem tuam.
> Quare dicant gentes:
> Ubinam est Deus eorum?
> Deus noster in caelo est;
> omnia, quæ voluit, fecit;

rendered by Knox:

> Not to us, Lord, not to us the glory; let thy name alone be honoured; thy name for mercy, thy name for faithfulness; why must the heathen say, Their God deserts them? Our God is a God that dwells in heaven; all that his will designs, he executes;

and in our P.B.V. (at least as clearly, nearer to the new Latin, and more rhythmically):

> Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy Name give the praise: for thy loving mercy and for thy truth's sake.
> Wherefore shall the heathen say: Where is now their God?
> As for our God, he is in heaven: he hath done whatsoever pleased him.

But Mgr Knox constantly brings to light points of beauty or interest easily overlooked or obscured. We would specially draw attention to his courage and fertility in translating the alphabetical Psalms (including the whole 119th) so as to bring out their acrostic arrangement. Such a feat is bound to entail some awkwardness, but brings to them a freshness and better understanding of their character.

HENRY DE CANDOLE.

HENFIELD.

VIEWPOINTS: (1) *Does Christianity Make Sense?* By F. A. Cockin. (2) *Body, Mind and Spirit.* By Philip Leon. (3) *Scrutiny of Marxism.* By J. M. Cameron. (4) *What is the Bible?* By S. H. Hooke. (5) *The Problem of Evil.* By J. S. Whale. (6) *Astrology and Prediction.* By C. F. Rogers. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d. each. *What I Believe.* B.B.C. Talks. Porcupine Press. 3s. 6d.

To the S.C.M. Press for its new series, *Viewpoints*, thinking men will admit a debt of gratitude. Here in each of the first six volumes we have a real expert expounding, within narrow compass so that even a busy person can readily read it, the Christian view on a pressing and vital problem of the day. Though short, these books are deep,

and they do not make brevity an excuse for evading the issue. The problems treated vary in their complexity, and therefore the demands made on the reader vary.

The Bishop of Bristol starts off the series with a masterly conspectus of the Christian faith, brim full of telling illustrations and demonstrating how dogma really does matter—it is not, as is sometimes popularly supposed, an irrelevant, academic pursuit. We have been accustomed, on the wireless if nowhere else, to the Bishop's characteristic formula of apologetic. "Yes," he starts off to his disputant, "of course you are right: I know you seem to have thought further than many of us Christians. But it is just there, at the point you have brought to light, that I have something vital to say." It is very effective, very winning. I only wonder whether his imaginary disputant can quite manage the technical terms, not of theology, but of philosophy which the Bishop uses. Such words as "premisses," and indeed the terms concerning logical argument in general, are in my experience unfamiliar to a majority of the present student generation.

Elementary philosophy has, most lamentably, been so completely missed out of most modern university courses that I much doubt whether many of those for whom I suppose this series is intended could tackle *Body, Mind and Spirit*, a most stimulating and up-to-date argument for spiritual interpretation of the universe. Mr Philip Leon starts from the fact that every man is inevitably a philosopher, and then, with an astonishing simplicity and conciseness considering the complexity of his theme and with an inescapable logic, establishes first the necessity of spirit, then the place of spirit and mind in nature, and so lastly the rules of the spiritual life. Mr Leon writes as a professional philosopher: he deals in passing with contemporary philosophers like Prof. C. D. Broad—his book, in fact, treats of the same problems as Broad's *Mind and its Place in Nature*, but in something rather less than one-sixth of the space. It is, in a sense, the most "difficult" book of the six *Viewpoints* so far published and is a triumph of compressed exposition and criticism.

Mr J. M. Cameron, writing also as a Roman Catholic, gives what many of us have been wanting for some time. We tend perhaps to take it too much for granted that we all know well enough what Marxism means: yet today, when it is the nominal philosophy of millions and appears sometimes as a menace near our own doorstep, such a scrutiny as this is just what is called for, that we may understand both its power and its fallacies, its debt to Hegel, and its development in the hands of Lenin and Trotsky. This book, most forcibly of all but by no means exclusively in the series, suggests that what has been grossly omitted from the popular presentation of the Christian faith in recent generations is the Christian interpretation of history—and on this theme the S.C.M. Press promises a book in this series in the near future.

Prof. Hooke stresses the fact that the Bible is one whole, not two almost unrelated testaments in one binding, and that as a whole it is an interpretation of history. He explains how the Sacred Writings came to be written, how the Canons of Old and New Testaments

were formed, and what the Church means by proclaiming that these writings are inspired.

The Problem of Evil is a reprint of Dr Whale's most successful series of broadcast talks: as it is talks written for broadcasting, this book probably reads the most easily of the series.

In *Astrology and Prediction* that great champion of the faith against popular fallacies, a Mr Valiant-for-Truth in our day and generation, re-enters the lists with that hard-hitting manner in controversy we have long associated with the name of Prof. Clement Rogers. He deals with the claims of the astrologers (who so greatly increased their following during the war years), of the British-Israel movement, and of Jehovah's Witnesses. While it is clearly of value to point out to addicts of astrology facts of astronomy, yet one feels that holders of such unreasonable beliefs are unlikely to be susceptible to reason. And there lies the one problem about this series—in an age that does not greatly care to base its views on reason but rather on prejudice and fashion, how can we secure that those who most need these books will read them, and read them with a readiness to follow argument?

It is interesting to have in permanent form the series of fifteen-minute broadcasts given under the title, *What I Believe*, by leading representatives of the beliefs that today lay claim to men's allegiance. The series *Viewpoints* is a triumph of condensation: to ask a man to condense for a radio audience his fundamental beliefs into fifteen minutes is to ask too much.

R. G. Lunt.

Liverpool College.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Spirit of Church History. By J. W. C. Wand. Mowbray. 5s.

The English Church in the Eighteenth Century. By C. S. Carter. Church Book Room Press. 6s.

Together Met. By Noel Harden. British Publishing Co., Gloucester. 8s. 6d.

Originally delivered as lectures to a mixed body of clergy and laity, the contents of the Bishop of London's little work must have made good hearing, and in their printed form they make hardly less good reading. In the narrow compass of some 110 small pages the bishop can, of course, offer no more than the broadest *aperçu* of his subject. But he has presented some of its most salient outlines in a way that is both lucid and entertaining; and behind his words one can always sense the wide knowledge of the expert and the practised skill of the born teacher, even though his fellow-students may not invariably share his views on disputed points. For the parochial clergy (whose knowledge of Church history is normally a bit rusty, if no worse) here is something which admirably fulfils the "refresher" aim with which the lectures were delivered; and the layman would not easily find better employment for a leisure evening (no more will be required) than in perusing a book which will probably teach him a great deal

that he doesn't know, and incidentally clear his mind of some common misconceptions. Its concluding pages evince a robust and heartening faith in the position and prospects of the *Ecclesia Anglicana.*

The English Church in the Eighteenth Century, by Dr C. S. Carter, is a reissue of a work first published in 1910 as one of a series of "Anglican Church Handbooks." (It is a melancholy reflection on the times that, the format being almost exactly the same, what could be produced for a shilling then now costs six shillings.) The book was favourably received on its first appearance; and it still deserves to rank as a readable, well-informed and unbiassed sketch of its subject. As it is largely based on the original sources it can claim to stand on its own feet; yet one cannot help wishing that, even if any recasting of the main text was found impracticable or unnecessary, at least a bibliographical note might have been appended at the end calling the reader's attention to work done on the period since the book first appeared—for example, the important writings of Prof. Norman Sykes and Canon Charles Smyth.

Mr Noel Harden's book, *Together Met: the Story of Ambleside Church and some of its associations*, is a pleasant and careful essay in local piety, which will naturally make its greatest appeal to those who live on the spot. Much of it is taken up with a minute description of Ambleside Church—a large Gothic structure with a lofty spire designed by Sir Gilbert Scott about 1850—and of the Victorian splendours with which it was progressively enriched. More interesting to the general reader will be the glimpses of the notable personages who lived in or visited the neighbourhood—of whom the Wordsworths, the Arnolds and the Cloughs stand out pre-eminent—and of the Cumbrian life of long ago and such surviving relics of it as the "Rushbearing." The picture of the Poet Laureate paying a state visit to the local bookshop in the purple velvet Court suit in which he was to receive the laureateship from Queen Victoria at Buckingham Palace suggests a very human and even humorous aspect of that eminent but rather pontifical figure! The book is well produced and is adorned with a number of beautiful photographs and sketches, and a "jacket" depicting Ambleside lying amid its girdle of hills.

C. S. Phillips.

Fordwich.

Behind that Wall. By E. A. Peers. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

This is a very attractive little book, and, apart from his translations, quite the most readable and convincing the author has produced. It consists of brief chapters on the life, personality and writings of fourteen of the great Christian authors, ranging from St Augustine and St Bernard, through Ruysbroeck and the Spanish mystics, to St Francis de Sâles, and ending with Jeremy Taylor, Vaughan and Traherne—the last two with the chapter on the Imitation being, in our opinion, the best in the book. The faults of the book, as of others which Prof. Peers has produced, are two; and these are not concerned with the treatment of his authors, which is always scholarly, but with his personal comments on their teaching, in which he seems to fall into

the opposite errors of making the interior life appear either too easy or else at the other extreme, so far as its higher reaches are concerned, impossibly difficult. The result for the reader being a feeling of perplexity and a disconcerting sense of unreality; a feeling that the Christian life is either too simple to be worth his pains, or quite beyond his reach, neither of which is true. But apart from this the book should succeed eminently in its purpose of attracting its readers to the originals quoted.

J. K. Byrom.

Neston-in-Wirral.

With Christ in God. By S. C. Hughson, O.H.C. S.P.C.K. 15s.

With Christ in God is a workmanlike study of the meaning and growth of the Christian life, which succeeds in being biblical and Christian throughout. The author's treatment of our exaltation to the heavenly places in the ascended Humanity of Christ is especially convincing and the best part of the book, the whole of which is obviously the ripe fruit of a life of prayer. There are, however, one or two criticisms. The first words of the preface are a very bad shock, whatever their explanation. Why is this book not for scholars? Are scholars outside the orbit of the love of God, or are they exempt from loving God themselves? Or is it not rather that some of the devotion in this book will hardly stand the test of scholarship? Beyond this the whole book is spoilt by a certain exuberant extravagance of language which seriously and continuously weakens the force of what is said. The style is didactic, if not pompous, and in places heavily archaic, which is exceedingly irritating to the reader. It seems a pity that a good book should be so spoilt by faults of this kind.

J. K. Byrom.

Neston-in-Wirral.

The Everyday Catholic. By Martin Harrison, O.P. Blackfriars, Oxford. 10s. 6d.

The author has produced a solid work of simple spirituality designed to explain the meaning, the obligations and the everyday implications of the Christian religion. Some of the early chapters are particularly helpful and penetrating, and the whole work is a model of conciseness. The five chapters on the Mass, however, are the most valuable in the book, and one could have wished that the author had treated the subject at much greater length. A few chapters on the principles underlying the Jewish sacrificial system, for example, and the fulfilment of their symbolism in the Christian sacrifice would have been of value to the everyday, as to any other, catholic. The only criticism is of the somewhat excessive use of maxims, some of which are a little too everyday and in places produce an effect of triviality. The publishers are to be congratulated on the production of a book which it is a pleasure both to handle and to read.

J. K. Byrom.

Neston-in-Wirral.

The True Life. By Luigi Sturzo. Geoffrey Bles. 15s.

According to this author, only those who believe in the supernatural can create an "Integral Sociology." Others think in abstractions which are less than the concrete totality of real life. "The sociologist must be a believer" (p. 17). No final truth will be found in "the naturalism which has entered into the fibre of modern society" (p. 215). Scientific humanism, Hegelian idealism, historical materialism, all fail because they seek to explain the natural in terms which are ultimately natural. In fact, the natural can only be understood in the light of the supernatural. We must live the supernatural life in the natural world. "The supernatural life consists in supernatural love of God and of our neighbour through grace, just as the natural life consists in love of God and our neighbour through simply natural forces" (p. 53). The consummation of true life is the beatific vision.

If the primary purpose of this book is to persuade the unbeliever to admit the operation of the supernatural, it might have been better to begin with a deeper criticism of naturalism. The reader might then have been more disposed to entertain a supernatural hypothesis. The partial truths of naturalism are, however, not denied. In an illuminating discussion of the activity of God in history, recognition is given to the reality of human freedom and the degree of goodness in the "natural" and the "secular." The activity of the supernatural in history culminates in Christ. "The Incarnation is the theocentric end of the whole creative work of God, and in Christ the whole universe is epitomized" (p. 160).

The translation is not always clear—*e.g.*, p. 149, "There is something that, from remorse, as recognition of guilt, passes without; it is the reality of the evil committed." The book lacks an index.

G. F. Woods.

Downing College,
Cambridge.

Christus Integritas: a Plea for Christian Healing. By a Priest-Doctor. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

This excellent and readable booklet is packed with useful information and sane conclusions. Its treatment of the reasons for lack of co-operation between priests and physicians is sympathetic on both sides and should do much to bring about a better understanding. It is significant that the author, himself a doctor as well as a priest, is able to lay his finger on such difficulties as co-operation between a priest who works by faith and a doctor who is unable to see beyond "suggestion."

The section on "Priest and Doctor in Training" is particularly useful and practical; while the whole of the last chapter on "The Future Task" is importantly suggestive, the call for a "policy" in Christian healing being strengthened by a reference to the opportunity that may be given by the new National Health Service.

This little book will repay careful reading, and it is hoped, as the author says in his foreword, that "the message of all-sufficiency of

Christus Integritas which is here presented will . . . commend itself to ministers of the Gospel and to doctors who accept or are sympathetic to the Christian position, and to any formulators of Anglican policy who may be willing to give it consideration."

Perhaps it would be well, however, to remember that suffering has a place in the theological system and the spiritual life.

G. Kendal Dovey, O.G.S.

Prestfelde,
Shrewsbury.

Christ is Alive. By G. R. Beasley-Murray. Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.

"The first preachers of the Gospel were men who were convinced that Jesus was alive, and they made His victory the key-note of their preaching. . . . There is no reason why the joyous certainty of that primitive Church should not be shared by the modern Church." These two sentences express the convictions out of which this book is written. The author sets out in the first part to demonstrate the truth of Christ's resurrection. He examines all the familiar evidence, challenges the prevalent assumption that Jesus could not have predicted His resurrection and makes the the interesting suggestion that if the Gospel of St Mark originally ended at xvi, 8 its testimony to the fact and importance of the empty tomb is all the stronger for the deliberate omission of any account of an appearance of Jesus. The second part of the book puts the challenge of the Resurrection: a man cannot believe it and his life remain unchanged. The author also outlines the theology of the Resurrection. Although not a master of original scholarship he moves easily through the work of other men and uses it to face the difficulties of thoughtful lay folk who are aware of the problems of which experts treat.

C. W. J. Bowles.

Ridley Hall,
Cambridge.

Weihnachten in der Alten Kirche. Maier, Basel. Swiss fr. 1·50.

This is a popular pamphlet by that well-known scholar, Prof. Oscar Cullmann. How did the Church come to keep January 6 and December 25, days with pagan and gnostic associations? Among many other interesting theories and suggestions was one that we must mention here. In Palestine shepherds "abide in the field" between March and November, which seems to prove conclusively that our Saviour's birth did not take place in the winter.

In the series *Theologische Existenz heute* (Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Munich) we have *Heft 5, Lutherisch-Reformiert heute,* in which Heinrich Vogel, author of *The Iron Ration of a Christian,* pleads for union between Lutherans and Reformed. In *Heft 7, Moglichkeiten und Grenzen einer Abendmahlsgemeinschaft,* Wilhelm Andersen makes a plea for intercommunion, and a statement of the Lthueran doctrine of the Real presence.

Heft 7, Luthers Predigt in den zwei Reichen. Luther's doctrine of the two kingdoms was, roughly, that the State enforces the law, while the

Church preaches the Gospel. Hermann Diem thinks that was all right in sixteenth-century "Christendom," but must be rejected today. He abandons the Lutheran order of "First law, then Gospel" for the Barthian "First Gospel, then Law," or "The law is the form of the Gospel." So he makes a slashing attack on the three uses of the law as set forth in the Formula of Concord (as well as by Bullinger, Calvin, Brunner and Vidler) on the score that it gives priority to the law, and either leads to, or proceeds from, an erroneous belief that the law is a revelation of God's will independent of the Gospel.

On this point, as on a hundred others, Dr Ehrenberg has remarked in that sagely challenging and provokingly conciliatory way of his. (*Luthertum Ökumenisch und Deutsch.* C. Bartelsmann, Gutersloh.) Yes, he says, the Lutherans are right. In the sphere of Revelation, Law precedes Gospel. The two must be distinguished but not separated, or else you get two half-messages, one legalistic, the other antinomian, and are in danger of falling into passive obedience. But in the sphere of the Church's preaching and pastoral work today Gospel precedes Law; so here the Barthians are right, but here too there are dangerous possibilities of fanaticism and legalism.

For our part, we think the threefold use of the Law too valuable to part with, since it enables us to preach the Law evangelically and the Gospel ethically.

C. W. QUIN.

KILLINAGH RECTORY,
CO. CAVAN.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment*)

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS (U.S.A.): J. W. Bowman, *The Religion of Maturity* ($3.00).

ALLEN AND UNWIN: S. Radhakrishnan, *The Bhagavadgita* (10s. 6d.); A. Loisy, *The Birth of the Christian Religion* (18s.).

ALLIANCE OF HONOUR: E. M. Smith, *Marriage and Home-making*; D. R. Mace, *Boy meets Girl*; A. H. Gray, *From Friendship to Marriage* (6d. each).

BEREAN PRESS: W. Robinson, *The Administration of the Lord's Supper* (1s. 6d.); James Gray, *Towards True Baptism* (1s.).

BLACKFRIARS: F. P. Armitage (Ed.), *A Torchbearer: Memoirs of Emily C. Fortey* (2s.); St Albert the Great, *Of Cleaving to God* (2s.).

BLACKWELL: G. F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit and Ourselves* (5s.); C. A. Simpson, *The Early Traditions of Israel* (63s.).

BLES: Gerald Vann, O.P., *Awake in Heaven* (7s. 6d.).

BLOUD ET GAY: H. Hemmer, *M. Portal, Prêtre de la Mission* (220 francs).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: E. K. Ellis, *Fountains Abbey* (1s. 6d.).

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: R. L. Child, *Baptists and Christian Unity* (6d.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: Constance Savery, *Bishop Guy Bullen* (1s.); *God's Purpose in Redemption* (Report of 114th Islington Clerical Conference) (2s. 6d.).

JAMES CLARKE: M. Chaning-Pearce, *Soren Kierkegaard* (4s. 6d.).

CLOISTER PRESS (LOUISVILLE, KY.): G. M. Day, *Can we believe in God?* (75 cents).

DACRE PRESS: *Butler of Wantage* (6s. 6d.); F. H. Maycock, *Original Sin* (3s.); J. Barker, C.R., *The Sacrifice of the People* (2s. 6d.); D. Edwards, C.R., *The Ultimate Choice* (2s. 6d.).

DOBSON: V. Solvyev, *Lectures on Godmanhood* (18s.).

EDITIONS DU SEUIL (PARIS): Erik Peterson, *Les Temoins de la Vérité* (n.p.).

FABER: J. C. Beckett, *Protestant Dissent in Ireland* 1687-1780 (15s.).

FALCON PRESS: *The Unpublished Diary of Pierre Laval* (12s. 6d.).
HODDER AND STOUGHTON: James Reid, *Where the New World Begins* (7s. 6d.).
I.V.F.: O. Hallesby, *Prayer* (6s.); D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Christ our Sanctification* (6d.); F. C. Maddox, *Set a Watchman* (2s.); H. W. Cragg, *The Conqueror's Way* (2s.).
KAISER VERLAG (MUNICH): Hermann Diem, *Die Kirche zwischen Russland und Amerika*; Karl Barth, *Christus und wir Christen*; Edmund Schlink, *Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften*; *Verkündigung und Forschung* (Theologischer Jahresbericht 1942-46) (n.p.).
KING'S CROWN PRESS (N.Y., U.S.A.): A. R. Eckardt, *Christianity and the Children of Israel* ($3.00).
LIVERPOOL DIOCESAN BOARD OF EDUCATION: *Unto a Perfect Man: a Report on Religious Education* (2s.).
LONGMANS: M. A. C. Warren (Ed.), *The Triumph of God* (15s.); N. Gorton, *The Anglican Church and Christian Unity* (2s.).
LUTTERWORTH PRESS: H. W. Robinson, *Two Hebrew Prophets* (6s.); Harold Knight, *The Hebrew Prophetic Consciousness* (10s. 6d.); G. O. Griffith, *The Theology of P. T. Forsyth* (6s.).
MOWBRAY: E. Evans, *To the Romans* (10s. 6d.); Sybil Harton, *In Company with Jesus* (1s. 9d.).
NISBET: G. S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man* (16s.); Ian Henderson, *Can Two Walk Together?* (10s.); H. H. Farmer, *God and Men* (10s. 6d.).
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Charles Williams, *Seed of Adam, and other plays* (6s.); C. F. Miller, *Prayers for Parish Worship* (10s. 6d.).
PORCUPINE PRESS: *What I Believe* (3s. 6d.).
PRESS AND PUBLICATIONS BOARD: *The Church and the Atom* (4s.).
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: A. B. Crabtree, *Jonathan Edwards' View of Man* (2s. 6d.); E. H. Hayes and Canon Popham (Ed.), *Myself and My Creed* (5s.).
SANDS: D. Burton, *The Angel who guarded the toys* (7s. 6d.); T. Lloyd, *The Forerunner* (n.p.); C. J. Woollen, *Christ in His Mystical Body* (6s.); C. Lattey, S.J. (Trans.), *The New Testament* (10s. 6d.); Dom B. Hicks, *Hugh Edmund Ford* (7s. 6d.); E. W. Whitehead, *A Form of Catholic Action* (2s. 6d.); G. V. Butler, *An Eastertide Greeting Book* (1s.).
S.C.M. PRESS: R. H. Bainton, *The Church of our Fathers* (12s. 6d.); C. Northcott, *Religious Liberty* (6s.); Karl Barth, *The Teaching of the Church regarding Baptism* (2s. 6d.); L. A. Zander, *Dostoyevsky* (10s.); H. P. van Dusen, *World Christianity* (8s. 6d.); Eric Hayman, *Prayer and the Christian Life* (8s. 6d.).
SHEED AND WARD: Maisie Ward, *Young Mr Newman* (21s.).
SHELDON PRESS: Sisters of the Cross, *Old Testament Stories* (3s.).
S.P.C.K.: N. H. Snaith, *The Jewish New Year Festival* (13s. 6d.); *What We Saw in Germany* (1s.); George and Bob Pamphlets, Nos. 1-7 (1½d. each); D. E. Baker, *Hymns and their use in Religious Instruction* (8d.); R. Hanson, *In the Day of Judgment* (1s. 6d.); F. H. Smith, *The Comparative Study of Religions* (1s.); Archbishop of Canterbury, *Redeeming the Situation* (1s. 6d.); A. Mortain, *Papal Claims* (1s. 6d.); D. B. MacGregor, *The Scots Church* (4d.); Bishop of London, *Our Day of Opportunity* (3s.); E. C. Rich, *Some Principles of Evangelism* (2s.); C. M. Chavasse, *Two Dreams* (1s. 6d.); F. L. Wyman, *Commission to Heal* (2s. 6d.); *This Thy Family* (Course IV: The Facts of the Risen Life) (1s.); Brenda Russell, *Tidings of Joy* (Course V: The Christian Life and Witness) (1s. 6d.); *Communion of the Sick with the Reserved Sacrament* (folded card) (1½d.); W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (27s. 6d.); H. S. Marshall, *A Piece of Granite* (4d.); A. G. Coombs, *The Meaning and Practice of Intercession* (6d.); G. Hoyland, *The Use of Silence* (6d.); Bishop of Truro, *Discipline and Detachment* (6d.); S. C. Carpenter, *A Paraphrase of Selections from St Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (1s. 3d.).
THEOLOGY (ATHENS): Θεολογια, Τομος ΙΘ' (1941-48) (n.p.).
TOWNSEND (EXETER): T. G. Jalland (Ed.), *The Israel of God: Papers read at Exeter, April, 1947, on the Church and the Ministry* (3s.).
ZWINGLI-VERLAG (ZURICH): O. Cullmann, *Die Tauflehre des Neuen Testaments* (5.50 francs).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher